

Historic, archived document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

Public Law 87-488

H. R. 10788

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|----|
| Index and summary of H. R. 10788 | .1 |
| Digest of Public Law 87-488 | .2 |

INDEX AND SUMMARY OF H. R. 10788

- Mar. 15, 1962 Rep. Cooley introduced H. R. 10788 which was referred to House Agriculture Committee. Print of bill as introduced.
- Mar. 16, 1962 Sen. Ellender introduced and discussed S. 3006, which was referred to the Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee. Print of bill as introduced and remarks of Sen. Ellender.
- Mar. 22, 1962 House committee voted to report (but did not actually report) H. R. 10788.
- Mar. 27, 1962 House committee reported H. R. 10788 without amendment. H. Report No. 1511. Print of bill and report.
- Apr. 2, 1962 House passed over H. R. 10788 on objection.
- Apr. 4, 1962 Senate committee reported S. 3006 without amendment. S. Report No. 1324. Print of bill and report.
- Apr. 5, 1962 House Rules Committee reported resolution for the consideration of H. R. 10788. H. Res. 589. H. Report No. 1555. Print of bill and report.
- Apr. 10, 1962 House began debate on H. R. 10788.
- Apr. 11, 1962 House passed H. R. 10788 without amendment.
- Apr. 12, 1962 H. R. 10788 was placed on the Senate calendar. Print of bill.
- May 14, 1962 Senate began consideration of H. R. 10788.
- May 15, 1962 Senate began debate on H. R. 10788.
- May 16, 1962 Senate continued debate on H. R. 10788.
- May 17, 1962 Senate passed H. R. 10788 with amendments in lieu of S. 3006.
- Senate conferees were appointed.
- S. 3006 laid on table due to passage of H. R. 10788.
- May 31, 1962 House conferees were appointed on H. R. 10788.

INDEX AND SUMMARY OF H. R. 10788, continued

| | |
|---------------|--|
| June 7, 1962 | Conferees agreed to file a report. |
| June 12, 1962 | House received conference report on H. R. 10788. H. Report No. 1817. Print of report. |
| June 14, 1962 | Both Houses agreed to the conference report on H. R. 10788. |
| | Both Houses agreed to H. Con. Res. 493, to correct an error in spelling in the conference report. Print of H. Con. Res. 493. |
| June 19, 1962 | Approved: Public Law 87-488. |

DIGEST OF PUBLIC LAW 87-488

REGULATION OF IMPORTS FROM NONPARTICIPATING COUNTRIES IN TRADE AGREEMENTS. Amends Sec. 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 so as to authorize the President to regulate the importation of agricultural commodities and products, including textiles and textile products, from countries who are not parties to multilateral trade agreements limiting imports of such items.

H. R. 10788

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MARCH 15, 1962

Mr. COOLEY introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture

A BILL

To amend section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 is amended
4 by inserting the following after the first sentence thereof:
5 “In addition, if a multilateral agreement has been or shall
6 be concluded under the authority of this section among coun-
7 tries accounting for a significant part of world trade in the
8 articles with respect to which the agreement was concluded,
9 the President may also issue, in order to carry out such an
10 agreement, regulations governing the entry or withdrawal
11 from warehouse of the same articles which are the products
12 of countries not parties to the agreement.”

87TH CONGRESS
2^D Session

H. R. 10788

A BILL

To amend section 204 of the Agricultural Act
of 1956.

By Mr. COOLEY

MARCH 15, 1962

Referred to the Committee on Agriculture

S. 3006

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

MARCH 16 (legislative day, MARCH 14), 1962

Mr. ELLENDER (by request) introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

A BILL

To amend section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 is amended
4 by inserting the following after the first sentence thereof:
5 “In addition, if a multilateral agreement has been or shall be
6 concluded under the authority of this section among coun-
7 tries accounting for a significant part of world trade in the
8 articles with respect to which the agreement was concluded,
9 the President may also issue, in order to carry out such an
10 agreement, regulations governing the entry or withdrawal
11 from warehouse of the same articles which are the products
12 of countries not parties to the agreement.”

A BILL

To amend section 204 of the Agricultural Act
of 1956.

By Mr. ELLENDER

MARCH 16 (legislative day, MARCH 14), 1962
Read twice and referred to the Committee on
Agriculture and Forestry

of Defense agencies in order to properly account for their personnel.

Civilian personnel reported separately in January for these agencies are not new additions to the rolls. Heretofore they have been included in the reports of either the Office of the Secretary of Defense, Army, Navy, or Air Force as shown in the enclosed tabulation.

In addition, separate reports are provided for certain other defense, interdepartmental and international military activities which heretofore have been included in the Office of the Secretary of Defense report, such as the Office of Civil Defense, the U.S. Court of Military Appeals, and the U.S. contingent of the Standing Group to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization which are not organizational components of the military departments or the Office of the Secretary of Defense. With the exception of the Office of Civil Defense, the numbers of personnel involved in these activities are small. The personnel for the Office of Civil Defense resulted from the transfer of civil defense personnel and functions from the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization to the Department of Defense in accordance with Executive Order 10952, July 20, 1961.

In recognition of the foregoing situation, discussions were held with members of your staff and with officials of the Civil Service Commission regarding the addition of a fifth component part to the monthly civilian employment report to bring together the agen-

cies and activities described above into a single reporting group and thus provide a more realistic and meaningful report. Therefore, the monthly report for January 1962 is submitted in five parts, as follows:

Office of the Secretary of Defense and Organization of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Army.

Navy.
Air Force.

Other defense activities.

Supplemental reports on Standard Form 113 are provided for each of the agencies and activities included in the new reporting group together with a consolidated summary for the entire Department of Defense. As requested by members of the committee staff, enclosed are additional data relating to internal Department of Defense reporting procedures, establishment of the Department of Defense agencies and the justification of budget estimates for fiscal year 1963 for those agencies.

If we can be of any further assistance on this matter, please let us know.

Sincerely,

CHARLES J. HITCH,

Assistant Secretary of Defense.

2. Civilian employment in "other defense activities" (separately organized within the Department of Defense but outside of the Departments of Army, Navy, and Air Force, and the Office of the Secretary of Defense) as of January 31, 1962:

| Agency or activity to which personnel were transferred in January | Agency from which personnel were transferred in January | | | | Other charges, net | | SF 113 (line 10) Jan. 31, 1962 |
|---|---|------|-----------|-------|--------------------|------|--------------------------------|
| | Army | Navy | Air Force | OSD | Gain | Loss | |
| Defense Communications Agency ¹ | | | | 116 | 5 | | 121 |
| Defense Intelligence Agency ¹ | 9 | 16 | 17 | 43 | 16 | | 107 |
| Office of Civil Defense ¹ | | | | 1,119 | | 2 | 1,117 |
| U.S. Court of Military Appeals ¹ | | | | 39 | | 1 | 38 |
| Interdepartmental activities ¹ | | | | 28 | | 3 | 35 |
| International military assistance ¹ | | | | 48 | | | 48 |
| Defense Supply Agency ² | 7,640 | 887 | 16 | 2 | 80 | | 8,625 |
| Defense Atomic Support Agency ³ | 2,032 | | | | 5 | | 2,037 |
| Total | 9,681 | 903 | 33 | 1,411 | 106 | 6 | 12,123 |

¹ Change in reporting effective January 1962 in accordance with provisions of DOD Instruction 7730.18. Through Dec. 31, 1961, personnel of these agencies or activities were included in the SF 113 totals of the agency from which transferred.

² Transfers were effective Jan. 1, 1962, per DSA G.O. No. 2, dated Dec. 20, 1961.

³ Change in reporting effective January 1962 in accordance with provisions of DOD Instruction 7730.18. Through Dec. 31, 1961, personnel of DASA were included in the Army SF 113 totals.

⁴ This total plus 15 intermittents (2 DSA and 13 DASA) equal the 12,143 reported on line 1 of January SF 113, "Other defense activities."

3. Department of Defense instructions, directives, etc., establishing defense agencies and activities within the Department of Defense, but outside of the Office of the Secretary of Defense and the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, follow:

Department of Defense Instruction 7730.18, February 6, 1962, subject: "Monthly Report of Civilian Employment."

Department of Defense Directive 5105.19, November 14, 1961, subject: "Defense Communications Agency (DCA)."

Department of Defense Directive 5105.22, November 6, 1961, subject: "Defense Supply Agency (DSA)."

Department of Defense Directive 5140.1, August 31, 1961, subject: "Assistant Secretary of Defense (Civil Defense)."

These figures are from reports certified by the agencies as compiled by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

Civilian employment reported by the executive agencies of the Federal Government, by months in fiscal year 1962, which began July 1, 1961, follows:

| Month | Employment | Increase | Decrease |
|--------------|------------|----------|----------|
| July 1961 | 2,465,804 | 16,700 | |
| August | 2,445,078 | 9,274 | |
| September | 2,427,216 | | 17,862 |
| October | 2,429,691 | 2,475 | |
| November | 2,437,709 | 8,018 | |
| December | 2,430,998 | | 6,711 |
| January 1962 | 2,428,691 | | 2,307 |

Total Federal employment in civilian agencies for the month of January was 1,368,628, a decrease of 3,209 as compared with the December total of 1,371,837. Total civilian employment in the military agencies in January was 1,060,063, an increase of 902 as compared with 1,059,161 in December.

Civilian agencies reporting the larger decreases were Post Office Department with 5,802 and Agriculture with 361. Increases were reported by National Aeronautics and Space Administration with 668, Treasury Department with 570, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare with 476, and Labor Department with 380.

Inside the United States civilian employment decreased 3,637, and outside the United States civilian employment increased 1,330. Industrial employment by Federal agencies in January totaled 564,961, a decrease of 4,234.

DEFENSE DEPARTMENT REORGANIZATIONS

Previous statements in the RECORD on the committee's series of monthly reports on Federal civilian personnel have carried generally at this point a statement of major Defense Department increases and decreases in the Office of the Secretary and the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

Such a comparison must be omitted in this statement relative to January 1962 employment because reorganizations in the Department of Defense have changed the organizational components for which the Department reports civilian personnel.

Recent changes ordered under authority of the Defense Department Reorganization Act of 1958 have established eight agencies and activities in the Department but outside of the Office of the Secretary and the three military departments.

The functions of these agencies and activities were transferred out of the Office of the Secretary and the three military departments which previously reported the civilian personnel. These agencies and activities are now reported as separate components in addition to the Office of the Secretary and the Departments of the Army, Navy and Air Force.

FOREIGN NATIONALS

The total of 2,428,691 civilian employees certified to the Committee by Federal agencies in their regular monthly personnel reports includes some foreign nationals employed in U.S. Government activities abroad, but in addition to these there were 169,545

Department of Defense Directive 5105.21, August 1, 1961, subject: "Defense Intelligence Agency."

Department of Defense Instruction 2010.1, March 1, 1961, subject: "Support of International Military Activities."

Defense Atomic Support Agency Charter, section 1, May 1, 1959, subject: "Defense Atomic Support Agency (DASA)."

Title 10, United States Code, section 867, article 67, subject: Court of Military Appeals.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD OF VIRGINIA

Executive agencies of the Federal Government reported civilian employment in the month of January totaling 2,428,691. This was a net decrease of 2,307 as compared with employment reported in the preceding month of December.

foreign nationals working for U.S. agencies overseas during January who were not counted in the usual personnel reports. The

number in December was 170,110. A breakdown of this employment for January follows:

| Country | Total | Army | Navy | Air Force | NASA |
|-------------------|---------|---------|--------|-----------|------|
| Australia..... | 1 | | | | 1 |
| Canada..... | 37 | | | 37 | |
| Crete..... | 50 | | | 50 | |
| England..... | 3,322 | | 72 | 3,250 | |
| France..... | 21,857 | 18,260 | 11 | 3,586 | |
| Germany..... | 80,785 | 67,904 | 85 | 12,796 | |
| Greece..... | 276 | | | 276 | |
| Greenland..... | 144 | | | 144 | |
| Japan..... | 53,491 | 19,057 | 14,517 | 19,917 | |
| Korea..... | 6,185 | 6,185 | | | |
| Morocco..... | 2,718 | | 825 | 1,893 | |
| Netherlands..... | 55 | | | 55 | |
| Norway..... | 24 | | | 24 | |
| Saudi Arabia..... | 2 | | | 2 | |
| Trinidad..... | 598 | | 598 | | |
| Total..... | 169,545 | 111,406 | 16,108 | 42,030 | 1 |

FEDERAL PAYROLL

(There is a lag of a month between Federal employment and Federal payroll figures in order that actual expenditures may be reported. Payroll expenditure figures in the committee report this month are for December.)

Payroll expenditure figures in the executive branch during the first 6 months of the current fiscal year 1962 totaled \$7.1 billion. These payroll expenditures for the first half of the fiscal year, July-December 1961, exclusive of \$156 million of U.S. pay for foreign nationals not on the regular rolls, follow:

[Payroll, in millions]

| | |
|----------------|---------|
| Month: | |
| July..... | \$1,128 |
| August..... | 1,231 |
| September..... | 1,160 |
| October..... | 1,187 |
| November..... | 1,199 |
| December..... | 1,217 |
| Total..... | 7,122 |

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. ELLENDER (by request):

S. 3006. A bill to amend section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. ELLENDER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MOSS:

S. 3007. A bill relating to the conservation of wildlife within Dinosaur National Monument; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HART:

S. 3008. A bill to establish an agency of the legislative branch of the Federal Government authorized to conduct the elections of Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. HICKEY:

S. 3009. A bill for the relief of Leonard F. Rizzuto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIBLE (by request):

S. 3010. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for commitments to, maintenance in, and discharges from the District Training School, and for other purposes", approved March 3, 1925, as amended;

S. 3011. A bill to amend section 4 of the act of Congress approved March 1, 1899, entitled "An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to remove

dangerous and unsafe buildings and parts thereof, and for other purposes";

S. 3012. A bill to amend the act of March 5, 1938, establishing a small claims and conciliation branch in the municipal court for the District of Columbia; and

S. 3013. A bill to amend the act of July 2, 1940, as amended, relating to the recording of liens on motor vehicles and trailers registered in the District of Columbia, so as to eliminate the requirement that an alphabetical file of such liens be maintained; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SCOTT:

S. 3014. A bill to amend the act of July 15, 1955, relating to the conservation of anthracite coal resources; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. SCOTT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia:

S. 3015. A bill for the relief of James B. Troup; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 3015. A bill to amend the act of March 2, 1929, and the Act of August 27, 1935, relating to load lines for oceangoing and coastwise vessels, to establish liability for surveys, to increase penalties, to permit deeper loading in coastwise trade, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PROXMIRE:

S. 3017. A bill for the relief of José Maria Bravo-Jimenez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

S.J. Res. 172. Joint resolution to provide that, for the purposes of the act entitled "An act to provide for the transfer of certain lands in the State of Idaho to the Idaho Ranch for Youth, Inc.," approved July 11, 1952 (66 Stat. A. 150), the Idaho Ranch for Youth, Inc., shall be held and considered to have made payment in full to the Secretary of the Interior for such land; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. DWORSHAK when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware (for himself, Mr. BYRD of Virginia, Mr. BOGGS, Mr. BEALL, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. KEATING, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. BUSH, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. JORDAN, and Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey):

S.J. Res. 173. Joint resolution relating to the treatment under the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 of casualty losses in areas designated by the President as disaster areas; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware when he introduced the above joint

resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mrs. NEUBERGER:

S.J. Res. 174. Joint resolution to authorize the establishment of a Commission to study the harmful effects of cigarette smoking; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mrs. NEUBERGER when she introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF SECTION 204 OF THE AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3006) to amend section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956, introduced by Mr. ELLENDER, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to the present occupant of the chair dated March 9, 1962, signed by Edward Gude-man, Acting Secretary of Commerce.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C., March 9, 1962.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Department of Commerce urges the introduction and enactment of the enclosed draft legislation "to amend section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956."

Section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 authorized the President to negotiate international agreements relating to the export to and the import by the United States of "any agricultural commodity or product manufactured therefrom or textiles or textile products." Because it was drafted primarily with bilateral agreements in mind, the existence of necessary power in the President with respect to nonparticipants in a broadly based multilateral agreement is questionable. In both the 1-year cotton textiles arrangement presently in force and the long-term cotton textiles arrangement, expected to come into force with substantially the same participants on October 1, 1962, provisions permit the United States to take action to prevent trade with nonparticipants in the arrangements from frustrating the purposes of the arrangements. Since countries accounting for 90 percent of the free world trade in cotton textiles are participants, the same authority which the President has already been delegated by section 204 should clearly be extended to nonparticipants to prevent the minority of countries which choose to stay out of the arrangements from thereby gaining an advantage over the countries which participate in them.

By the term "significant" in the draft is meant significant to the national interest of the United States. The term "products" is intended to convey the concept of origin, that is, "products of countries" means articles which are the growth, manufacture, or produce of those countries.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that, from the standpoint of the administration's

program, there is no objection to the presentation of this legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD GUDEMAN,
Acting Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I received a telephone call from Mr. Hodges, the Secretary of Commerce, explaining the urgency of passage of the bill.

The bill would authorize the President, for the purpose of carrying out any agreement under section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956, to limit the importation of any agricultural commodity or product covered by such agreement from countries not participating in the agreement. It would be applicable only in the case of agreements where imports from participating countries account for a significant part of the world trade in the article.

Section 204 authorizes the President to enter into agreements with foreign countries limiting the importation of any agricultural commodity. He does not have clear authority at present to limit imports from countries not participating in the agreement, and this bill would provide such authority. At present the only agreement under section 204 is the 1-year cotton textile arrangement in which 19 countries participate. Passage of the bill is urgently needed to prevent anticipated imports from non-participating countries vitiating the effect of the agreement.

CONSERVATION OF ANTHRACITE COAL RESOURCES

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, to bill to authorize the United States to participate on a matching fund basis with the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania as part of a previously authorized anthracite conservation program, to seal abandoned coal mines and to fill voids in abandoned coal mines in those instances where it is economically justified and where the work is in the interest of public health or safety.

Mr. President, the anthracite mine drainage law of 1955 established the congressional policy of providing for the control and drainage of water in anthracite mines in order to conserve natural resources, promote the national security, prevent injuries and loss of life, and preserve public and private property. The act recognized that the presence of large volumes of water in the anthracite coal formations involves serious wastage of full resources to the Nation and constitutes a menace to health and safety as well as to the national security. This act established an \$8.5 million fund to be expended under a 50-50 matching program with the States, for drainage in the anthracite coal area. It further provided for the purchase and installation of pumps and other machinery and equipment necessary for the pumping of water from the mines. The language in the act prohibited the Federal Government from using any of its funds for operation and maintenance. The funds could only be used for the purchase, supply, and installation of drainage pumps.

As the program progressed, it became evident that in order that it might be

fully effective, the sealing of abandoned coal mines and the filling of voids in such mines was also required. It is noted that the present act is not broad enough to encompass this work. Thus, the program has not been effective, because the cost of operating and maintaining the pumps became so expensive that there were no communities, individuals, or companies able to take on this type of expense. It has been indicated by testimony given by Federal, State, and local authorities that there has been some surface subsidence and the large areas of the anthracite region are in danger of subsidence by reason of abandoned mines. This, to a large extent, could be prevented or alleviated by the authorization that would be granted by this legislation.

It is my feeling, Mr. President, that because of the unique situation in the anthracite region of Pennsylvania, an expansion of the basic Anthracite Conservation Act would be amply justified.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3014) to amend the act of July 15, 1955, relating to the conservation of anthracite coal resources, introduced by Mr. SCOTT, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the conservation of anthracite coal resources through measures of flood control and anthracite mine drainage, and for other purposes", approved July 15, 1955 (30 U.S.C. 572), is amended in the following respects:

(1) The second sentence of section 1 is amended to read as follows: "It is therefore declared to be the policy of the Congress to provide for the control and drainage of water in the anthracite coal formations and thereby conserve natural resources, promote national security, prevent injuries and loss of life, and preserve public and private property, and to seal abandoned coal mines and to fill voids in abandoned coal mines, in those instances where such work is in the interest of the public health or safety."

(2) The preamble clause of section 2 is amended to read as follows: "The Secretary of the Interior is authorized, in order to carry out the above-mentioned purposes, to make financial contributions on the basis of programs or projects approved by the Secretary to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania (hereinafter designated as the 'Commonwealth') to seal abandoned coal mines and to fill voids in abandoned coal mines, in those instances where such work is in the interest of the public health or safety, and for control and drainage of water which, if not so controlled or drained, will cause the flooding of anthracite coal formations, said contributions to be applied to the cost of drainage works, pumping plants, and related facilities but subject, however, to the following conditions and limitations:"

(3) Section 2(b) is amended to read as follows: "The total amount of contributions by the Secretary of the Interior under the authority of this Act shall not exceed \$8,500,000, of which \$1,000,000 of the unexpended balance remaining as of June 30, 1961, shall

be reserved for the control and drainage of water;"

(4) Section 2(c) is amended to read as follows: "The amounts contributed by the Secretary of the Interior under the authority of this Act and the equally matched amounts contributed by the Commonwealth shall not be used for operating and maintaining projects constructed pursuant to this Act or for the purchase of culm, rock, or spoil banks;"

(5) Section 2(d) is amended by striking out the word "and" after the semicolon;

(6) Section 2(e) is amended to read as follows: "Projects constructed pursuant to this Act shall be so located, operated, and maintained as to provide the maximum conservation of anthracite coal resources or, in those instances where such work would be in the interest of the public health or safety, to seal abandoned coal mines and to fill voids in abandoned coal mines, and, where possible, to avoid creating inequities among those mines which may be affected by the waters to be controlled thereby; and";

(7) Section 2 is further amended by adding a new subsection to read as follows:

"(f) Projects for the sealing of abandoned coal mines or the filling of voids in abandoned coal mines shall be determined by the Secretary of the Interior to be economically justified. The Secretary shall not find any project to be economically justified unless the potential benefits are estimated by him to exceed the estimated cost of the project."

(8) Section 5 is amended by adding a sentence to read as follows: "The Secretary of the Interior shall, on or before the first day of February of each year after the institution of the program for the sealing of abandoned coal mines or the filling of voids in abandoned coal mines, submit a report to Congress of the actions taken under this Act."

Mr. KEATING subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a bill which the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] introduced today may lie on the table for 3 days for additional cosponsors.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LOADLINES FOR OCEANGOING AND COASTWISE VESSELS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the act of March 2, 1929, and the act of August 27, 1935, relating to loadlines for oceangoing and coastwise vessels, to establish liability for surveys, to increase penalties, to permit deeper loading in coastwise trade, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, requesting the proposed legislation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3016) to amend the act of March 2, 1929, and the act of August 27, 1935, relating to loadlines for oceangoing and coastwise vessels, to establish liability for surveys, to increase penalties, to permit deeper loading in coastwise trade, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, March 9, 1962.

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is transmitted herewith a draft of a proposed bill, "To amend the act of March 2, 1929, and the act of August 27, 1935, relating to loadlines for oceangoing and coastwise vessels, to establish liability for surveys, to increase penalties, to permit deeper loading in coastwise trade, and for other purposes."

The purpose of this proposal is to amend the laws governing loadlines of U.S. vessels engaged in the oceangoing and coastwise trade to incorporate certain changes found to be necessary from the application of these laws over the past two decades.

Since the loadline laws governing oceangoing vessels are so similar to the loadline laws governing coastwise vessels the changes proposed to each are nearly identical.

Present law prohibits only the departure of an overloaded vessel from a port or place of loading. It does not prohibit the overloading of U.S. merchant vessels at all times when upon the navigable waters of the United States or the high seas or prohibit the overloading of foreign vessels when in U.S. territorial waters. The bill would plug this loophole in the law which permits vessels to operate in dangerous overloaded condition without fear of penalty so long as they are not departing a loading port or place. Since the purpose of the law is to improve and promote safety, it logically should apply to a vessel at all times, inasmuch as the dangers of overloading are always present and not solely when departing a port.

The law currently authorizes any collector of customs to detain a vessel suspected of being overloaded and to require the vessel to be surveyed and examined prior to permitting such vessel to proceed to sea. Although Coast Guard officers are deemed to be officers of the customs (14 U.S.C. 143), this fact is not apparent on the face of the law. When Coast Guard officers initiate action in such cases, it is often necessary for them to explain to vessel owners the basis of their authority. In order to make such authority clearly apparent, the bill would specify Coast Guard district commanders as officials empowered to act under the statutes. Such a change would appear logical since appeals under the law are to the Commandant of the Coast Guard.

These loadline surveys are for the purpose of confirming or refuting the original finding of a violation and for determining suitable corrective action if the vessel is found to be overloaded. Costs of such surveys may run as high as several hundred dollars in a typical case. Existing law does not clearly specify who should pay these costs. With the enactment of the present proposal to apply the loadline laws to arriving vessels in addition to departing ones it is expected that there will be a considerable increase in the occasions for such surveys. The Government should not be required to bear the costs of loadline surveys where the original finding of a violation is confirmed by the survey. Instead such costs should be borne by the vessel owners. This indirect penalty would tend to discourage violations and would intensify enforcement of the law. Consequently, the bill would authorize the collection of costs of surveys from vessel owners where the survey shows the vessel to be in violation of the law.

The present monetary fines and penalties incurred for violations of the law range from \$100 for failure to log a vessel's drafts and applicable loadline markings to \$1,000 for knowingly permitting or causing a change in a vessel's loadline markings. These fines

and penalties are not realistic when they are compared to the monetary gains to be realized through overloading. U.S. penalties are also more lenient than those of other leading maritime nations. The bill would increase the penalties from \$100 to \$500 for failure to make correct log entries, from \$500 to \$1,000 for permitting a vessel to proceed to sea overloaded, from \$500 to \$1,000 plus an additional \$500 for each inch of draft in overloading, and from \$1,000 to \$2,000 for knowingly permitting or causing a change in loadline markings. The increased penalties would enhance enforcement of these laws, discourage deliberate violations, and promote greater safety of vessels at sea.

Vessels engaged in the coastwise trade must by reason of existing law adhere to certain standards in loading prescribed in the International Load Line Convention, 1930. The bill would strike from the Coastwise Load Line Act reference to these standards. With this change, increases in draft could be prescribed by regulations, but such increases could not exceed the actual line of safety for a vessel. Increased drafts for vessels in this trade have been urged by shipping interests repeatedly. Such increases were found satisfactory during World War II. Other maritime countries sanction such departures from the standards of the convention for their domestic trade vessels. Modification of convention standards is not feasible in the foreseeable future due to current international complications. A revision in the Coastwise Load Line Act as proposed would permit the accomplishment of the change desired.

It would be appreciated if you would lay the proposed bill before the Senate. A similar proposed bill has been transmitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection from the standpoint of the administration's program to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

DOUGLAS DILLON.

TITLE TO CERTAIN LANDS IN STATE OF IDAHO TO THE IDAHO RANCH FOR YOUTH, INC.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, there is no more humanitarian or worthy cause we can sponsor than to furnish the proper environment and opportunity for rehabilitation and training of those boys who have no homes or who have been in some kind of minor difficulties. The time, money, and effort we expend in a proper manner will usually be repaid to society a thousandfold.

A group of public-spirited people in the State of Idaho, led by Rev. James R. Crow and his wife, founded an "Idaho Youth Ranch" with the theme that, "It is better to salvage a citizen than to corral a criminal," and formed a nonprofit organization under the laws of the State of Idaho. On July 11, 1952—66 Stat. A150—an act of Congress made it possible for this group to purchase a 2,560-acre project of raw desertland near Rupert, Idaho. From this they are developing a ranch which will be, in fact is now, a haven for underprivileged boys.

Mr. President, the joint resolution I am introducing at this time would offer the same benefits that Secretary Udall has placed in effect on public parks and playgrounds and on use of lands for school purposes in the purchase of this tract. In fact, this group has already

paid \$4 per acre for this land, which is \$1.50 an acre more than the flat fee now in effect for the purchase of recreation and school sites from the Department of the Interior. I consider the uses of this land the highest for which it can be utilized and feel sure that Members of this Congress will agree with me.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 172) to provide that, for the purposes of the act entitled "An act to provide for the transfer of certain lands in the State of Idaho to the Idaho Ranch for Youth, Inc.," approved July 11, 1952 (66 Stat. A150), the Idaho Ranch for Youth, Inc., shall be held and considered to have made payment in full to the Secretary of the Interior for such land, introduced by Mr. DWORSHAK, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas, by administrative order of May 31, 1961, the Secretary of the Interior established a new public land pricing schedule under which State and local governments may purchase public lands for park and recreational purposes at the rate of \$2.50 per acre;

Whereas, by administrative order of July 25, 1961, the Secretary of the Interior announced a new pricing schedule under which State and local governments and nonprofit private organizations may purchase public land sites for school construction at the rate of \$2.50 per acre;

Whereas the Idaho Ranch for Youth, Incorporated, a nonprofit organization, has received from the United States certain public lands situated in the State of Idaho under the provisions of an Act of July 11, 1952, and dedicated such lands to public uses; and

Whereas the Idaho Ranch for Youth, Incorporated, has made payment to the Secretary of the Interior amounting to \$4 per acre as compensation for such lands under the provisions of such Act: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Act entitled, "An Act to provide for the transfer of certain lands in the State of Idaho to the Idaho Ranch for Youth, Incorporated," approved July 11, 1952 (66 Stat. A150), the Idaho Ranch for Youth, Incorporated, shall be held and considered to have made payment in full to the Secretary of the Interior for the lands received under the provisions of such Act.

TREATMENT UNDER INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954 OF CASUALTY LOSSES IN AREAS DESIGNATED BY THE PRESIDENT AS DISASTER AREAS

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the day before yesterday I discussed the possibility of amending the Internal Revenue Code in a manner whereby persons suffering losses in a disaster area—an area which has been de-

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF
BUDGET AND FINANCE

(For information only;
should not be quoted
or cited)

Issued March 23, 1962
For actions of March 22, 1962
87th-2d, No. 43

CONTENTS

| | | |
|---------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|
| Acreage allotments.....28 | Education.....9 | Potatoes.....28 |
| Adjournment.....19 | Electrification.....6,30 | Property.....32 |
| Appropriations.....14,18 | Feed grains.....1 | Public debt.....30 |
| Banking.....5,13 | Foreign trade.....7,27 | Public works.....10 |
| Conservation.....8 | Honeybees.....11 | Reclamation.....30 |
| Contracts.....29 | Legislative program.....18 | Retirement.....15 |
| Cooperatives.....5,12 | Livestock diseases.....2 | Rural development.....17 |
| Cotton textiles.....7 | Loans.....4 | Stockpiling.....21 |
| Crop insurance.....20 | Perishable commodities...3 | Sugar.....26 |
| Dairy.....16 | Personnel.....15,31 | Taxation.....12 |

HIGHLIGHTS: House passed bill to permit summer fallow lands to participate in feed grains program. House Rules Committee cleared tax bill. House committee voted to report Youth Conservation Corps bill. House committee voted to report bill for import-export controls on nonparticipants in multilateral cotton textile agreements. Sen. Muskie and Reps. Cooley and McIntire introduced and Sen. Muskie and Rep. McIntire discussed bills to provide supply management program for potatoes.

HOUSE

- 1. FEED GRAINS.** Passed without amendment S. 2533, to permit farmers in summer fallow areas to receive barley, corn, and grain sorghum price support and to participate in the corn and grain sorghum diversion program provided they reduce their corn and grain sorghum acreage to the extent necessary to bring their acreage of corn, grain sorghum, and barley down to not more than 80 percent of the 1959-60 average of those three crops. This bill will now be sent to the President. A similar bill, H. R. 8914, was laid on the table. pp. 4372-81
- 2. LIVESTOCK DISEASES.** The Agriculture Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) with amendments S. 860, to grant the Secretary of Agriculture additional authority to provide greater protection against the introduction and dissemination of diseases of livestock and poultry. p. D200
- 3. PERISHABLE COMMODITIES.** The Agriculture Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) with amendments S. 1037, to amend the provisions of the

Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act retarding fees, oral hearings, and re-licensing of persons under the Act. p. D200

4. LOANS. The Agriculture Committee voted to report (but did not actually report, with amendments H. R. 946, to extend to oyster planters the benefits of the provisions of present law which provide for production disaster loans for farmers and stockmen. p. D200
5. COOPERATIVES. The Agriculture Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) H. R. 10374, to reduce the revolving fund available for subscriptions to the capital stock of the banks for cooperatives. p. D200
6. ELECTRIFICATION. The Agriculture Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) H. R. 10708, to amend section 203 of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, with respect to communication service for the transmission of voice, sounds, signals, pictures, writing, or signs of all kinds through the use of electricity. p. D200
7. FOREIGN TRADE. The Agriculture Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) H. R. 10788, to amend section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 to authorize the President to extend import-export controls to non-participants in multilateral cotton textile agreements. p. D200
8. CONSERVATION. The Committee on Education and Labor voted to report (but did not actually report) H. R. 10682, to authorize the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps. p. D201
9. EDUCATION. The "Daily Digest" states that the Education and Labor Committee "ordered introduced in the House in lieu of H. R. 10390, the Adult Basic Education Act of 1962 (clean bill -- H. R. 10860)." p. D201
10. PUBLIC WORKS. Subcommittee No. 4 of the Judiciary Committee voted to report to the full committee with amendments H. J. Res. 464, to provide for the designation of the week commencing October 1, 1961, as "National Public Works Week." p. D201
11. HONEYBEES. The Agriculture Committee reported without amendment H. R. 8050, to prohibit the importation of all honeybees of the genus *Apis* in the adult stage except for research purposes by this Department or as the Secretary shall determine (H. Rept. 1477). p. 4392
12. TAXATION; COOPERATIVES. The Rules Committee reported a resolution for the consideration of H. R. 10650, the proposed Revenue Act of 1962, including revisions in tax provisions relative to cooperatives (see Digest 38 for items of interest). p. 4393
13. BANKING. The Banking and Currency Committee reported without amendment H. R. 10162, to amend the Bretton Woods Agreements Act to authorize the U. S. to participate in loans to the International Monetary Fund to strengthen the international monetary system (H. Rept. 1484). p. 4393
14. APPROPRIATIONS. The Appropriations Committee was granted until midnight tonight, Mar. 23, to file a report on the Labor, HEW and related agencies appropriation bill for 1963. p. 4371
15. RETIREMENT. Rep. Olsen discussed his bill H. R. 10706, to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act so as to provide for increases in annuities, eliminate

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

• Feed grain program participation bill passed by House

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages 4452-4476

Bills Introduced: 10 bills were introduced, as follows:
S. 3050-3059. Page 4463

Bills Referred: Three House-passed bills were referred to appropriate committees. Page 4424

Indians: Conference report was adopted on H.R. 4130, to lessen the impact of termination of Federal services to the Menominee Indian Tribe of Wisconsin. This action cleared the bill for the White House. Page 4409

Aviation: The following additional conferees were appointed to serve on the committee of conference on S. 1969, to amend the Federal Aviation Act so as to provide for supplemental air carriers: Senators Magnuson, Engle, and Scott. Page 4409

Hamilton Memorial—Poll Tax: Senate continued debate on Mansfield motion to proceed to consideration of S.J. Res 29, to establish Alexander Hamilton's home as a national memorial. It has been announced that after Senate agrees to take up the bill Senator Holland will offer an amendment as a substitute, proposing a constitutional amendment relating to payment of poll tax. Pages 4395-4409, 4411-4423, 4431-4444, 4447-4452

Program for Friday: Senate met at 9 a.m., and recessed at 7:36 p.m. until 9 a.m. Friday, March 23, when it will continue on motion to consider S.J. Res. 29, Alexander Hamilton memorial. Pages 4394, 4476

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

POSTAL RATES

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service: Committee resumed its hearings on H.R. 7927, proposed Postal Revision Act of 1962, receiving testimony from Bernard E. Esters, National Editorial Association; Maurice K. Henry, Kentucky Press Association; G. Richard Dew, Pennsylvania Newspaper Publishers' Association; William E. Branen, Wisconsin Press Association; R. E. Fisher and Phil Fourney, both of the West Virginia Press Association, all of whom were accompanied by Theodore A. Serrill, executive vice president, National Editorial Association; and Zoltan Gombos, editor and publisher, Hungarian Daily Szabadsag, Cleveland, who was introduced by Senator Lausche. Also participating in today's hearings was Senator Cooper.

Hearings continue on Tuesday, March 27.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Bills Introduced: 13 public bills, H.R. 10884-10896; 7 private bills, H.R. 10897-10903; and 3 resolutions, H. Res. 574-576, were introduced. Page 4393

Bills Reported: Reports were filed as follows:

H.R. 8050, relating to importation of honey bees (H. Rept. 1477);

Twelfth report of the Committee on Government Operations entitled "Cuba's Expropriation of U.S.-Owned Nickel Plant at Nicaro, Cuba" (H. Rept. 1478);

H.R. 10098, authorizing the exchange of certain lands at Antietam National Battlefield Site (H. Rept. 1479);

H.R. 9805, changing the name of Whitman National Monument to Whitman Mission National Site (H. Rept. 1480);

H.R. 10573, a private bill (H. Rept. 1481);

H. Res. 575, open rule providing for the consideration of and 1 hour of debate on H.R. 4441, to provide an ex gratia payment to the city of New York to assist in defraying expenses of 15th General Assembly of the United Nations (H. Rept. 1482); and

H. Res. 576, closed rule providing for the consideration of, 8 hours of debate on, and the waiving of points of order against, H.R. 10650, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a credit for investment

in certain depreciable property and to eliminate certain defects and inequities (H. Rept. 1483). Pages 4392-4393

Late Reports: Permission to file reports by midnight Friday was granted to the Committee on Appropriations on a bill making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies; and the Committee on Government Operations on sundry bills.

Similar permission to file reports by midnight Saturday was granted the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on H.R. 4999, to increase the opportunities for training of physicians, dentists, and professional public health personnel; Committee on Banking and Currency on H.R. 10162, to authorize the United States to participate in loans to the International Monetary Fund to strengthen the international monetary system; and the Committee on Rules to file sundry reports. Pages 4371, 4372, 4384, 4388

D.C. Unemployment Compensation: House adopted the conference report on H.R. 5968, to amend the D.C. Unemployment Compensation Act, as amended, and thus cleared the legislation for Presidential action. Page 4371

Air Carriers—Supplemental: The Speaker today appointed Representatives Jarman and Devine as additional conferees on S. 1969, to provide for supplemental air carriers. Page 4372

Feed Grain Program: By a voice vote the House passed S. 2533, to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act relative to 1962 feed grain program eligibility, without amendment, and thus cleared the legislation for Presidential consideration.

H. Res. 572, the open rule under which the bill was considered had been adopted earlier by a voice vote. Pages 4372-4381

Duty-Free Steel Imports: By a voice vote the House passed H.R. 9778, to provide for the free entry of certain steel and steel products donated for an addition to the Chippewa County War Memorial Hospital, Sault Sainte Marie, Mich. Page 4381

Legislative Program: The legislative program for the week of March 26-31 was announced by the majority leader. Pages 4386-4387

Calendar Wednesday: Agreed to dispense with Calendar Wednesday business of March 28 and April 4. Page 4387

Program for Monday: Adjourned at 1:33 p.m. until Monday, March 26, at 12 o'clock noon when the House will consider D.C. legislation with one bill scheduled for consideration as follows: H.R. 10573, a private bill to grant the American Numismatic Association perpetual succession.

Committee Meetings

AGRICULTURAL MISCELLANY

Committee on Agriculture: Met in executive session and ordered reported favorably to the House the following bills:

S. 860 (amended), to provide greater protection against the introduction and dissemination of diseases of livestock and poultry;

S. 1037 (amended), to amend the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act to authorize increases in license fees and give the Secretary of Agriculture more discretionary authority with respect to licensing thereunder;

H.R. 946 (amended), to extend to oyster planters the benefits of the provisions of the present law which provide for production disaster loans for farmers and stockmen;

H.R. 10374, to reduce the revolving fund available for subscriptions to the capital stock of the banks for cooperatives;

H.R. 10708, regarding communication service for the transmission of voice, sounds, signals, pictures, writing, or signs of all kinds through the use of electricity; and

H.R. 10788, to amend section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956.

Also approved the following watershed projects: Gum Neck, N.C.; Pine Creek, Tenn.; Leon River, Tex., and Wagon Creek, Okla.

AGRICULTURAL ACT

Committee on Agriculture: Held a hearing on H.R. 10788, to amend section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 (multilateral agreements—cotton textiles). Heard testimony from Hickman Price, Jr., Assistant Secretary for Domestic Affairs, Department of Agriculture, and other departmental witnesses; also various public witnesses.

WHEAT

Committee on Agriculture: Subcommittee on Wheat met in executive session on the wheat section of H.R. 10010, the general farm bill.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

Committee on Armed Services: Continued hearings on H.R. 10202, to authorize certain construction at military installations, and heard testimony from departmental witnesses. Hearings continue Friday, March 23.

SOLE SOURCE PROCUREMENT

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee for Special Investigations met in executive session on sole source procurement. Adjourned subject to call of the Chair.

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF
BUDGET AND FINANCE

(For information only;
should not be quoted
or cited)

Issued March 28, 1962
For actions of March 27, 1962
87th-2d, No. 47

CONTENTS

| | | |
|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| ACP.....21 | Education.....32,38 | Government operations...18 |
| Animal disease.....22 | Electrification.....24,30 | Land reform.....28 |
| Appropriations...7,9,38,41 | Employment.....34 | Lands.....30,31 |
| Area redevelopment.....1 | Farm program.....8,28,40 | Legislative program.....7 |
| Capital improvements..1,23 | Flood insurance.....5,20 | Patents.....11 |
| Conservation.....21 | Foreign affairs.....19 | Peace Corps.....26 |
| Contracts.....13 | Foreign aid.....5 | Personnel.....27,32 |
| Cotton.....12 | Foreign trade....3,8,12,29 | Public Law 480.....5 |
| Dairy price supports.....2 | Forest Service.....25 | Public works.....23 |
| Disaster loans.....36 | Forestry.....10 | Reclamation.....37 |
| | | Retirement.....33 |
| | | Ryukyu Islands.....39 |
| | | School lunch.....14 |
| | | Small business.....15 |
| | | Surplus property.....35 |
| | | Taxation.....33 |
| | | Territories.....14 |
| | | Textiles.....16 |
| | | Tobacco.....17 |
| | | Transportation.....4 |
| | | Waterfowl.....21 |

HIGHLIGHTS: House subcommittee voted to report agriculture trade development section of farm bill. House passed Labor-HEW appropriation bill. Sen. Chavez submitted Administration proposal for immediate capital improvements program in redevelopment areas.

SENATE

1. AREA REDEVELOPMENT; CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS. Sen. Chavez submitted a proposed amendment, received from the President, to S. 2965, the proposed Standby Capital Improvements Act of 1962, to authorize immediate initiation of a \$600 million capital improvements program in redevelopment areas and in communities which have been designated for 12 months or more as areas of substantial unemployment. pp. 4675-8
Sen. Humphrey commended the President's proposed amendment. pp. 4696-8
2. DAIRY PRICE SUPPORTS. Sen. Wiley inserted his statement urging enactment of legislation to provide for dairy price supports at between \$3.11 and \$3.40 per hundredweight and a newspaper editorial, "Need Action in Dairy Crisis, Not Political Maneuvers." p. 4717
3. FOREIGN TRADE. Sen. Wiley urged adoption of a foreign trade policy which would provide for "promoting export trade but, at the same time, guarding against too great harm to our domestic industries from a too-large volume of imports." pp. 4716-7

4. TRANSPORTATION. Sen. Cotton expressed "impatience with the administration's failure to send a timely message to Congress dealing with the serious problems in transportation," and inserted an editorial, "Indifference, in High Places, Toward Common Carriers." pp. 4719-20
5. FOREIGN AID. Sen. Humphrey inserted an article discussing the use of Public Law 480 counterpart funds for rehabilitation of crippled children in Brazil and urged greater use of these funds for such purposes. pp. 4722-3
6. FLOOD INSURANCE. Sen. Dodd urged that steps be taken to "reactivate the provisions of the Federal Flood Insurance Act of 1956." p. 4724
7. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Sen. Mansfield announced that the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill will be considered Wed., Mar. 28. p. 4694

HOUSE

8. FARM PROGRAM. The "Daily Digest" states that the Subcommittee on Foreign Agriculture Operations of the Agriculture Committee "ordered reported favorably to the full committee title II (amended), the agriculture trade development section of H. R. 10010, the general farm bill." p. D213
9. APPROPRIATIONS. Passed with an amendment H. R. 10904, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies for 1963. pp. 4728-57
Received from this Department a report on an overobligation of an allotment. p. 4774
10. FORESTRY. Received from this Department a proposed bill "to add certain land-utilization project lands to the Pike National Forest in Colorado and the Carson National Forest and the Santa Fe National Forest in New Mexico; to Agriculture Committee. p. 4774
11. PATENTS. Received from Commerce a proposed bill "To fix the fees payable to the Patent Office"; to Judiciary Committee. p. 4774
12. FOREIGN TRADE. The Agriculture Committee reported without amendment H. R. 10780 to amend section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 to authorize the President to extend import-export controls to non-participants in multilateral cotton textile agreements (H. Rept. 1511). p. 4774
13. CONTRACTS. The Education and Labor Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) H. R. 10766, to amend the Davis-Bacon Act to define the term "wages" as used in the Act. p. D213
14. TERRITORIES. The Subcommittee on Territorial and Insular Affairs of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee voted to report to the full committee with amendments H. R. 10062, to extend the application of certain laws to American Samoa including extension of the provisions of the National School Lunch Act to Samoa and authorizing the USDA to make available to the territory technical, scientific, and other agricultural program assistance on a selective and limited basis. p. D213
15. SMALL BUSINESS. Rep. Ashley discussed his bill H. R. 10683, to repeal the small business set-aside in Government construction, maintenance and repair contracts, saying, "the construction set-aside as presently operated is

REGULATION OF TEXTILE IMPORTS

MARCH 27, 1962.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. COOLEY, from the Committee on Agriculture, submitted the following

R E P O R T

[To accompany H.R. 10788]

The Committee on Agriculture, to whom was referred the bill (H.R. 10788) to amend section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

PURPOSE

Section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 authorizes the President to enter into voluntary agreements with representatives of foreign governments covering the export from such countries and the importation into the United States of any agricultural commodity or product, including textiles or textile products, and to issue regulations governing the entry of products which are the subject of such agreement, in order to carry out the intent of those agreements.

Under the authority of this section, a voluntary agreement relating to cotton textiles has been negotiated with the representatives of 18 other nations. The countries participating in the anticipated agreement cover 90 percent of the free world trade in cotton textiles. The present provisions of the law will permit the President to issue regulations concerning the entry of cotton textiles into the United States which will carry out the provisions of this agreement.

The purpose of this bill is to add to section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 an additional sentence which will permit the President to issue regulations which will make the provisions of the agreement effective also against the small minority of cotton textile exporting countries which are not parties to the agreement. In the absence of such authority it might be possible for such countries, although their exports now constitute only a small portion of the total, to increase

those exports to such an extent as to nullify the voluntary action of those countries which have entered into the agreement.

The Governments which negotiated the long-term cotton textile arrangement are Australia, Austria, Canada, Denmark, India, Japan, Norway, Pakistan, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, the United Kingdom (also representing Hong Kong), the United States, and the member states of the European Economic Community (Belgium, France, Germany, Italy, Luxembourg, and the Netherlands).

COST

There would be no additional cost to the United States as the result of the enactment of this bill.

DEPARTMENTAL APPROVAL

H.R. 10788 was introduced at the request of the Secretary of Commerce, contained in an executive communication to the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Its enactment has been recommended by the Departments of State, Labor, and Agriculture. Representatives of producer and textile groups appeared at the hearing on the bill in support of its enactment. There were no opposition witnesses and the committee knows of no opposition to the bill.

Following is the executive communication from the Secretary of Commerce and the letters from the Departments of State, Labor, and Agriculture:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C., March 9, 1962.

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: The Department of Commerce urges the introduction and enactment of the enclosed draft legislation to amend section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956.

Section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 authorized the President to negotiate international agreements relating to the export to and the import by the United States of "any agricultural commodity or product manufactured therefrom or textiles or textile products." Because it was drafted primarily with bilateral agreements in mind, the existence of necessary power in the President with respect to nonparticipants in a broadly based multilateral agreement is questionable. In both the 1-year cotton textiles arrangement presently in force and the long-term cotton textiles arrangement, expected to come into force with substantially the same participants on October 1, 1962, provisions permit the United States to take action to prevent trade with nonparticipants in the arrangements from frustrating the purposes of the arrangements. Since countries accounting for 90 percent of the free world trade in cotton textiles are participants, the same authority which the President has already been delegated by section 204 should clearly be extended to nonparticipants to prevent the minority of countries which choose to stay out of the arrangements from thereby gaining an advantage over the countries which participate in them.

By the term "significant" in the draft is meant "significant to the national interest of the United States." The term "products" is

intended to convey the concept of origin; that is, "products of countries" means articles which are the growth, manufacture, or produce of those countries.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that, from the standpoint of the administration's program, there is no objection to the presentation of this legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD GUDEMAN,
Acting Secretary of Commerce.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, March 22, 1962.

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY,
*Chairman, House Committee on Agriculture,
House of Representatives.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing to express the support of the Department of State for the enactment of H.R. 10788, a bill to amend section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956.

The Department of State concurs in the necessity for the enactment of H.R. 10788. This Department joined with other interested departments in drafting this bill and joins them in urging prompt enactment of it.

The Department of State was engaged together with other interested departments in the negotiation of both the short-term and the long-term cotton textile arrangements. The arrangements provided that action could be taken under certain circumstances against non-participants. This bill will confer upon the President the authority needed to implement these provisions.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection from the standpoint of the administration's program to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

FREDERICK G. DUTTON,
Assistant Secretary
(For the Acting Secretary of State).

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, March 21, 1962.

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY,
*Chairman, House Committee on Agriculture,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN COOLEY: I am taking this opportunity to set forth the Department of Labor's position on H.R. 10788, a bill recently referred to your committee which would amend section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956.

As you know, section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 authorizes the President to carry on the negotiation of international agreements limiting the importation into the United States of agricultural commodities including textiles and textile products. Since section 204 was apparently principally intended to enable the President to nego-

tiate on a bilateral basis with respect to these commodities, there is some question as to whether the President can apply similar limits to nonparticipants where broad multilateral agreements are entered into.

The 1-year cotton textiles arrangement presently in force, and also the long-term cotton textiles arrangement expected to come into force on October 1, 1962, have substantially the same participating countries. These arrangements contain provisions permitting the United States to act to prevent trade with nonparticipants from frustrating the design and purpose of the arrangements. Since approximately 90 percent of the free world trade in cotton textiles is carried on by the countries participating in these arrangements, we believe that the same authority which the President has under section 204 with respect to participants should be extended to nonparticipants. Such authority would prevent the minority of countries which choose to stay out of arrangements from thus gaining an advantage over participating countries. H.R. 10788 would vest such authority in the President.

The necessity for resolving the question which presently exists is of obvious importance to the Department of Labor. Particularly, it should be noted that the Interagency Textile Administrative Committee on which this Department is represented has studied the terms of H.R. 10788 and has recommended its enactment. Accordingly, I urge favorable action on this proposal.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that it has no objection to the presentation of this report from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Yours sincerely,

ARTHUR J. GOLDBERG,
Secretary of Labor.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, March 26, 1962.

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY,
*Chairman, Committee on Agriculture,
House of Representatives.*

DEAR MR. COOLEY: This refers to H.R. 10788, a bill to amend section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956.

We favor the enactment of this bill.

Section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 authorizes the President to negotiate international agreements relating to the export to and the import by, the United States of "any agricultural commodity or product manufactured therefrom, or textiles or textile products." Because it was drafted primarily with bilateral agreements in mind, the existence of necessary power in the President with respect to nonparticipants in a broadly based multilateral agreement is questionable.

In both the 1-year cotton textiles arrangement presently in force and the long-term cotton textiles arrangement expected to come into force with substantially the same participants on October 1, 1962, provisions permit the United States to take action to prevent trade with nonparticipants in the arrangements from frustrating the purposes of the arrangements. Since countries accounting for 90 percent of the free world trade in cotton textiles are participants, the same

authority which has been given to the President by section 204 should clearly be extended to nonparticipants to prevent the minority of countries that choose to stay out of the arrangements from thereby gaining an advantage over the countries that participate in them.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the presentation of this report from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely yours,

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN, *Secretary.*

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with clause 3 of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, changes in existing law made by the bill are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets, new matter is printed in italics, and existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956

* * * * *

TITLE II—SURPLUS DISPOSAL

AGREEMENTS LIMITING IMPORTS

SEC. 204. The President may, whenever he determines such action appropriate, negotiate with representatives of foreign governments in an effort to obtain agreements limiting the export from such countries and the importation into the United States of any agricultural commodity or product manufactured therefrom or textiles or textile products, and the President is authorized to issue regulations governing the entry or withdrawal from warehouse of any such commodity, product, textiles, or textile products to carry out any such agreement. *In addition, if a multilateral agreement has been or shall be concluded under the authority of this section among countries accounting for a significant part of world trade in the articles with respect to which the agreement was concluded, the President may also issue, in order to carry out such an agreement, regulations governing the entry or withdrawal from warehouse of the same articles which are the products of countries not parties to the agreement.* Nothing herein shall affect the authority provided under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act (of 1933) as amended.



Union Calendar No. 636

87TH CONGRESS
2^D SESSION

H. R. 10788

[Report No. 1511]

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MARCH 15, 1962

Mr. COOLEY introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture

MARCH 27, 1962

Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

A BILL

To amend section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 is amended
4 by inserting the following after the first sentence thereof:
5 “In addition, if a multilateral agreement has been or shall
6 be concluded under the authority of this section among coun-
7 tries accounting for a significant part of world trade in the
8 articles with respect to which the agreement was concluded,
9 the President may also issue, in order to carry out such an
10 agreement, regulations governing the entry or withdrawal
11 from warehouse of the same article which are the products
12 of countries not parties to the agreement.”

A BILL

To amend section 204 of the Agricultural Act
of 1956.

By Mr. COOLEY

MARCH 15, 1962

Referred to the Committee on Agriculture

MARCH 27, 1962

Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on
the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

HOUSE

17. APPROPRIATIONS. The Appropriations Committee reported (on Mar. 30) H. R. 11038, the second supplemental appropriation bill, 1962 (H. Rept. 1548), which includes items for ARS, AMS, and Forest Service (see table at end of this Digest for a summary of these items). The bill also includes \$25,000,000 for disaster relief assistance to States and local governments, \$17,000,000 for U. S. participation in the New York World's Fair, \$18,000 for salaries and expenses of the Delaware River Basin Commission, \$5,000,000 additional capital for the GSA general supply fund to provide for increased sales, and \$85,000,000 increased capital for the revolving fund of the Small Business Administration.
- Conferees were appointed on H. R. 10526, the Treasury-Post Office Department and Executive Office of the President appropriation bill (p. 5060). Senate conferees have already been appointed.
- Received from the President an amendment to the budget for 1963 involving an increase of \$6 million for the civil functions of the Department of the Army (H. Doc. 378). p. 5160
- Received from the President amendments to the budget for 1963 involving a net decrease of \$265,000 for civil functions of the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army (H. Doc. 379). p. 5160
18. FARM PROGRAM. The "Daily Digest" states that the Subcommittee on Dairy and Poultry of the Agriculture Committee "ordered reported favorably to the full committee title III /on marketing orders/ (amended), of H. R. 10010, the general farm bill. Also ordered reported subtitle C /on dairy/ (amended), of title IV, without recommendation." p. D235
19. LIVESTOCK DISEASES. Passed under suspension of the rules S. 860, to grant the Secretary of Agriculture additional authority to provide greater protection against the introduction and dissemination of diseases of livestock and poultry. pp. 5121-4
20. PERISHABLE COMMODITIES. Passed under suspension of the rules S. 1037, to amend the provisions of the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act regarding fees, oral hearings, and relicensing. pp. 5124-6
1. SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM. At the request of Rep. Ford, passed over without prejudice H. R. 8962, to revise the formula for apportioning cash assistance funds among the States under the National School Lunch Act. p. 5061
22. FORESTRY. Passed with an amendment H. R. 9822, to provide that lands within a national forest acquired under section 8 of the Act of June 28, 1934, as amended (43 U.S.C. 315g), may be added to the national forest. p. 5061
23. WILDLIFE. Passed as reported H. J. Res. 489, to provide protection for the golden eagle. pp. 5062-6
24. HONEYBEES. Passed without amendment H. R. 8050, to prohibit the importation of all honeybees of the genus *Apis* in the adult stage except for research purposes by this Department or as the Secretary shall determine. p. 5078
25. WEIGHTS AND MEASURES. At the request of Rep. Gross, passed over without prejudice H. R. 2049, to provide that the National Bureau of Standards shall conduct a program of investigation, research, and survey to determine the practicability of the adoption by the U. S. of the metric system of weights and measures. p. 5061

26. LOANS. Passed as reported H. R. 946, to extend to oyster planters the benefits of the provisions of the present law which provides for production disaster loans for farmers and stockmen. pp. 5078-9
27. FOREIGN TRADE. On objection of Rep. Curtis, Mo., passed over H. R. 10788, to amend section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 to authorize the President to extend import-export controls to non-participants in multilateral cotton textile agreements. pp. 5079-80
28. RESEARCH. At the request of Rep. Ford, passed over without prejudice H. R. 6984, to provide for a method of payment of indirect costs of research and development contracted by the Federal Government at universities, colleges, and other educational institutions. pp. 5080-1
29. BUDGETING. Passed without amendment H. R. 10613, to repeal subsection (d) of section 16 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 which requires detailed budget estimates for appropriations to be used for purchase or hire of passenger motor vehicles or for purchase, maintenance, or operation of aircraft. p. 5081
30. PERSONNEL; TRANSPORTATION. Passed without amendment H. R. 10652, to provide a more reasonable allowance for transportation of house trailers or mobile dwellings by certain governmental officers and employees upon their transfer from one official station to another. p. 5081
31. BANKING. By a vote of 255 to 94, passed under suspension of the rules H. R. 10162, to amend the Bretton Woods Agreements Act to authorize the U. S. to participate in loans to the International Monetary Fund to strengthen the international monetary system. pp. 5086-99
32. RECREATION. Passed under suspension of the rules H. R. 1171, to increase the public benefits from the national fish and wildlife conservation areas through their incidental or secondary use for public recreation. pp. 5099-102
33. TERRITORIES. Passed under suspension of the rules H. R. 10062, to extend the application of certain laws to American Samoa including extension of the provisions of the National School Lunch Act to Samoa, and authorizing the head of any Federal department to extend to American Samoa, without reimbursement, such scientific, technical, and other assistance under any program which it administers as, in the judgment of the Governor, will promote the welfare of American Samoa (pp. 5127-8). The committee report includes the following statement regarding costs: "The bill provides for no increase in authorized appropriations. The amount of aid which may be requested under section 1 of the bill is limited to \$150,000 a year ... Other items in the bill will be charged to regular departmental appropriations as need occurs."
34. EDUCATION. The Education and Labor Committee reported without amendment H. R. 10896, the proposed Adult Basic Education Act of 1962 (H. Rept. 1551). p. 5161

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

35. FOREIGN CURRENCIES. Extension of remarks of Rep. Findley stating that "an \$86 million assist to the U. S. gold problem is possible as the result of new Public Law 480 agreements which utilize a new feature of the law." pp. A2509-10

and this includes oyster planters—in an effort to determine if our oyster planters who were confronted with difficulties by the mysterious "virus X" could qualify in disaster loan programs sponsored by the Government.

While the incursion of this deadly virus has not to date noticeably affected our oyster planters, the neighboring waters of Virginia have felt the impact of this deadly virus and I am apprehensive lest our adjacent waters are likewise affected.

Mr. DOWNING's measure, H.R. 946, would end loan discrimination against oyster planters. My study reveals oyster planters have been excluded from various disaster loan programs.

I can remember too well the extensive damage that two hurricanes have brought to our dirt and oyster farmers. The economy of my district suffered serious damage, particularly our oyster farmers. While we have a public law which makes a source of credit available to dirt farmers, our oyster farmers are entitled to no such relief. Mr. Downing's measure rectifies this injustice and I wholeheartedly support the passage of this bill.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, the action taken by the House today in approving H.R. 946 is of great importance to the Fifth District of Maryland.

Farming of oysters is a major industry in the estuaries of my district, as it is in the estuaries of almost every coastal State. The oyster planter is an underwater farmer. He either buys or produces his own seed, which he plants on his growing beds. The success of oyster planting is adversely affected by unfavorable weather conditions in the same way as land farming. Severe storms damage the beds and the oysters planted on them. In such cases the oysters resting on the leased bottoms are covered with a deposit of sand and mud so that they are smothered and die, or the oyster's may actually be swept off the hard grounds onto the adjacent soft mud where they sink into the bottom. The bottoms themselves are frequently rendered unsuitable for future planting without extensive restoration work by the planter. Some planted beds of oysters have been killed by a sharp drop in salinity brought about by the torrential rains which accompany hurricanes. Such a loss was sustained by oyster planters some years ago in our sister Chesapeake State of Virginia. Oysters can live in brackish waters with a salinity of about five parts of salt to a thousand parts of water. If the salt content is reduced below this level for any extended period of time, these wonderful bivalves cannot survive. During a hurricane the vast amount of fresh water flowing down a river, such as the Potomac, could greatly dilute the salt and be just as destructive to oysters as if they were covered with silt and mud. The parallel to the problems of the land farmer is striking indeed.

Oysters are the only cultivated marine animals in the waters of the United States. Since oysters are sedentary for all their adult life, they remain on the bottom locations where they are laid

down by the planter. This single characteristic has made possible the development of marine underwater farming. There is every expectancy that the crop will remain where it is planted until it is ready for harvesting, unless it is moved by man or moved or destroyed by storms.

Today, our oyster planters, who are so important to the future development of our marine food resources, are not afforded the assistance from the Federal Government needed for them to recover from natural disasters. H.R. 946 provides this assistance by placing oyster planters in the same category as land farmers under the provisions of the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act. No additional appropriations are needed now to effectuate this legislation since emergency loans to planters would be within the total funds authorized each year by the Congress to the Farmers Home Administration. Personally, it is my fervent hope that oyster planters are never forced to use the provisions of this legislation. They are independent, responsible hard working people who are used to handling their affairs very much like the land farmers in this great land of ours. But when disaster strikes from natural forces beyond their control, I feel they deserve to have the same consideration and Federal support as the land farmer would have in comparable circumstances.

The need for this legislation is urgent. The recent coastal disaster which damaged shellfish all the way from New York to North Carolina is an excellent example of the need. There is every reason to believe that comparable storms will occur in the future. We should be prepared to help these farmers of the sea to restore their unique business.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CERTIFICATES OF CITIZENSHIP IN THE CANAL ZONE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 9351) to authorize the issuance of certificates of citizenship in the Canal Zone.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 101(a) (38) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 171; 8 U.S.C. 1101(a) (38)), is amended by adding thereto the following sentence: "For the purpose of issuing certificates of citizenship to persons who are citizens of the United States by virtue of section 303 of this Act, the term 'United States' as used in section 341 of this Act includes the Canal Zone."

With the following committee amendment:

On line 7, after the words "United States" strike out "by virtue of section 303 of this Act".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REGULATION OF TEXTILE IMPORTS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 10788) to amend section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, it seems to me that a bill of this extensive nature has no business on the Consent Calendar. I understand it is also listed for consideration under suspension. And it is my understanding that it will not be brought up under suspension today. I would like to see it withdrawn from the Consent Calendar. And in order to start it on its way, I would object.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my unanimous-consent request that the bill be passed over without prejudice, so that those who want to object may do so at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

H.R. 10788

(Mr. FINDLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, one of the most widely heralded proposals before this session of Congress is the one to increase Presidential authority to lower tariffs.

From studying the avalanche of material emanating from the State Department and the White House, one might conclude that the goal of the administration is a greater degree of free trade among nations.

H.R. 10788 should make us all pause and wonder just what is afoot.

Testifying in behalf of this bill before the Committee on Agriculture on March 23, Assistant Secretary of Commerce Hickman Price, Jr., had this to say:

I appear here today to provide you with the view of the Department of Commerce and of the departments represented on the Interagency Textile Administrative Committee in support of H.R. 10788, introduced by the chairman to amend section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956.

The Interagency Textile Administrative Committee was established by the President's Cabinet Textile Advisory Committee at the direction of the President to carry out the rights and obligations of the United States under the short-term arrangement relating to international trade in cotton textiles and textile products provided for in the International Textile Agreement of July 21, 1961, at Geneva. The Departments represented are State, Treasury, Agriculture, Labor, and Commerce.

At the direction of the President, acting under authority of section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956, which we now seek to amend, the State Department called a conference of the principal countries engaged in importing and exporting cotton textiles. The conference agreed upon the short term arrangement mentioned above which provides for the orderly international marketing of

textiles between participating countries for a period of 1 year ending September 30, 1962. A long term cotton textile arrangement, expected to come into force on October 1, 1962, was later drafted.

In both arrangements, provisions permit the United States to take action to prevent trade with nonparticipants in the arrangements from frustrating the purposes of the arrangements. Participants will undertake under the terms of the arrangement not to export in amounts sufficient to disrupt the markets of importing countries.

The amendment to section 204 which would be provided by the enactment of H.R. 10788 now under consideration would clearly establish the authority of the President to prevent a minority of countries engaged in textile trade who are not participants to the arrangements to gain an advantage over the participants in the competition for our textile markets.

Probable shipments from nonparticipants in volume which may be sufficient to jeopardize the orderly marketing provided by the arrangements have been brought to our attention and we urge your early and favorable action on H.R. 10788 to provide clear authority in the President to deal with such action.

This legislation would clarify Presidential authority to help rig the world cotton textile market through multinational agreement and to discriminate against cotton from nations not in the deal.

All this started innocently enough back in the 1930's when Government established an acreage control and price-support program to help the cotton farmer. One thing led to another, because controls beget controls. Artificial pricing led to export subsidies. Export subsidies gave foreign textile mills an unfair advantage over U.S. mills.

In this bill we have the most colossal offspring of all: legislative authority for a program aimed at rigging cotton textile markets on an international scale.

This smacks of the discriminatory quota and cartel schemes which have already supplanted tariffs as regulators of a great portion of world commerce.

The prize example in the United States is our sugar quota system. Government decides who gets how much of U.S. sugar business. Sugar trade has become part and parcel of foreign policy, and the private enterprise market in U.S. sugar is almost a thing of the past. The consumer pays the penalty, and our rigged markets irritate sugar producers and would-be producers not in the favored circle.

Is this where we are headed in the New Frontier foreign trade program? Are we to scrap the equitable, honest, and open tariff system in favor of deals worked out by Executive authority, deals like the one just concluded in cotton?

Secretary of State Dean Rusk, speaking February 21, 1962, at the Chamber of Commerce of Charlotte, N.C., had this to say:

Either we believe in capitalism, in the freedom of individual enterprise, or we do not. And we do not if we hold with massive Government intervention to distort and freeze the operation of the market. If we look to Government to rig the game, we may as well look to it to play the hands. If we mean to discourage the forces of free enterprise all around the world, I can think of no better way of doing it—without even

stirring from our chairs—than to shrink from competition behind unrealistic tariff walls.

How can Mr. Rusk reconcile this statement with his Department's support of H.R. 10788? Are we not, in this bill, shrinking from competition behind quotas? Are we not indeed violating our most-favored-nation policy in foreign trade?

To paraphrase Mr. Rusk: Either we believe in free trade or we do not. And we do not, if we hold with massive government intervention to distort and freeze the operation of the world cotton textile market.

If we look to Government to rig the game, we may as well look to it to play the hands. If we mean to discourage the forces of free enterprise all around the world, I can think of no better way of doing it—without even stirring from our chairs—than to shrink from competition behind quotas.

PAYMENTS OF COSTS OF RESEARCH AT UNIVERSITIES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6984) to provide for a method of payment of indirect costs of research and development contracted by the Federal Government at universities, colleges, and other educational institutions.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I am very familiar with a number of instances where there might be a controversy concerning this legislation. Perhaps the gentleman from Wisconsin has a comment or two; and I yield to him at this time.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I believe this legislation should be studied very carefully. The House of Representatives took action just this last week to limit again the overhead costs as far as research grants in the Department of HEW are concerned, particularly at the National Institutes of Health, to 15 percent. Personally I favor a 20-percent limitation as far as these costs are concerned. The whole matter is presently under study by the various subcommittees on appropriations, because we have the Department of Defense granting indirect costs up to 100 and 121 percent. I think this whole matter should be gone into very carefully. I believe this bill should be looked at thoroughly and not considered under the procedure of the Consent Calendar.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. This bill has nothing to do with the percentage to be allowed. It does not change that in any ways. It just provides that the estimated amount will be the amount paid. The total amount to be paid will not be changed.

Mr. LAIRD. If you will notice the report, Wilbur J. Cohen, Assistant Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, makes it very clear that the bill does not apply to that department because of the 15 percent

limitation which is written into the appropriation act for that particular department. There is consideration at the present time about writing similar legislation into all of the appropriation acts so that we will have a specific figure set in all the departments of the Government.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MEADER. This bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on Government Operations as the result of hearings and in response to an appeal by the Administrator of Educational Institutions. It happens that the University of Michigan has had to wrestle with this problem. It arises because in January of 1956 the Comptroller General in a ruling provided that under cost-type research contracts there could not be a fixed rate for a certain percentage of administrative costs agreed upon between the Government agency and the educational institution conducting the research, because of a provision of a general bill which would prohibit the cost-plus-a-fixed-fee type of contract. The Comptroller General appeared before the committee and had no objection to this bill. The reason for asking for this authority in the research contract is that at the present time an estimate is made of indirect cost. Then after the research contract is fulfilled and completed, there is in effect a renegotiation of the indirect cost which may result in increasing the allowance on indirect cost or decreasing it. But in the meanwhile, in addition to all of the bookkeeping and auditing required in this procedure, the institutions are unsettled as to their own budgeting of their affairs, because they do not know just what they are eventually going to receive. This would be of benefit both to the Federal Government and to the research institutions. They would have a determined knowledge of what they were going to receive. It would be subject to negotiation, of course.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman from Michigan has made a point which bears on my discussion of the bill. I feel that we should have a uniform policy in the Government. We will have some paying 50 percent, some 58 percent, and some 15 percent. The point I am making is whether you negotiate before or after; I believe a uniform indirect cost rate should be established. One department should not have one particular limitation and another department have an open-end proposition. I believe this whole matter needs careful and thorough study by the Congress.

Mr. MEADER. Is it the interpretation of the gentleman from Wisconsin that the passage of H.R. 6984 would permit the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in its research grants to contract for a fixed rate for indirect costs in excess of the limitation of 15 percent contained in the appropriation bill?

Mr. LAIRD. Certainly, that is true as far as contracts are concerned. The

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF
BUDGET AND FINANCE

(For information only;
should not be quoted
or cited)

Issued April 5, 1962
For actions of April 4, 1962
87th-2d, No. 52

CONTENTS

| | | |
|----------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|
| Agricultural imports.....1 | Foreign trade.....19,25 | Personnel.....6,37 |
| Appropriations.....8 | Forestry.....2 | Public Law 480.....7 |
| Conservation.....21 | Forests.....22 | Public works.....20 |
| Cotton.....9 | Intergovernmental | Reclamation.....14 |
| Electrification.....4,24 | relations.....12 | Recreation.....2,23 |
| Expenditures.....16 | Lands.....21,22 | Taxation.....18 |
| Farm program.....3,17 | Milk.....15 | Textiles.....1,13 |
| Foreign aid.....26 | Minerals.....10 | Transportation.....5 |
| Foreign currencies.....7 | Pay.....6 | Watersheds.....11 |

HIGHLIGHTS: House passed supplemental appropriation bill. Senate committee reported bill for agricultural import restrictions on nonparticipating countries in multilateral trade agreements. Sen. Anderson and others introduced and Sen. Anderson discussed bills to establish outdoor recreation facilities program and land conservation fund.

SENATE

1. AGRICULTURAL IMPORTS. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported without amendment S. 3006, to amend Sec. 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 so as to authorize the President to regulate imports of agricultural commodities, including textiles and textile products, from nonparticipating countries of multilateral trade agreements (S. Rept. 1324) (p. 5402). The committee had voted to report the bill earlier (p. D245).

2. FORESTRY; RECREATION. Both Houses received from the President a proposed bill to provide for the establishment of a land conservation fund from proceeds from recreation user charges on public lands, sales of surplus Federal lands, use of recreational equipment on public lands, etc., for use in accelerating Federal acquisition of lands for park, recreation, forest, and certain fish and wildlife purposes, including additional lands around Federal reservoir projects; to S. and H. Interior and Insular Affairs Committees. pp. 5402, 5502

Both Houses received from the Secretary of the Interior a proposed bill to promote the coordination and development of effective Federal and State programs

relating to outdoor recreation, and to provide financial assistance to the States for outdoor recreation planning, through the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation of the Department of the Interior; to S. and H. Interior and Insular Affairs Committees. pp. 5402, 5502

3. FARM PROGRAM. Sen. Mansfield stated that Montana "is confronted with several unusual situations which are making it extremely difficult at this time to accept, without reservation, a farm program designed to meet national needs," and inserted a letter from a Mont. farmer discussing farm problems. pp. 5415-6
4. ELECTRIFICATION. Sen. Moss inserted Assistant Secretary of Interior Holum's address before the recent Wisc. Electric Cooperative meeting at Madison, Wisc., discussing the Administration's electric power program. pp. 5417-9
5. TRANSPORTATION. Sen. Gruening protested "the great burden borne by all Alaskans because of excessively high steamship rates." p. 5439
6. PERSONNEL; PAY. Received the report of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Non-essential Federal Expenditures on Federal employment and pay for Feb. 1962. pp. 5402-7
7. FOREIGN CURRENCIES. Sen. Humphrey commended the agreement by the U. S. and Poland for the use of foreign currencies from the sale of surplus agricultural commodities under Public Law 480 to support cooperative medical research and medical information projects in Poland, and urged greater use of foreign currencies for this purpose. pp. 5449-50

HOUSE

8. APPROPRIATIONS. Passed with amendment H. R. 11038, the second supplemental appropriation bill for 1962 (pp. 5457-79). See Digest 50 for items of interest. Rejected the following amendments:
 - By Rep. Andersen, Minn., 46 to 66, to delete \$2,500,000 for ARS for screw-worm eradication. p. 5467
 - By Rep. Gross, 35 to 98, to reduce by \$7,000,000 the amount for U. S. participation in the New York World's Fair. p. 5468
9. COTTON. The Agriculture Committee reported without amendment H. R. 11027, to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 so as to extend to the 1962 crop the authority to permit operators of farms with flooded-out cotton acreage to transfer cotton acreage allotments to another farm operated by the same farmer in the same or an adjoining county (H. Rept. 1552). p. 5502
10. MINERALS. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) H. R. 10566, to provide for the withdrawal and orderly disposition of mineral interests in certain public lands in Pima County, Ariz. p. D248
11. WATERSHEDS. Received from the Budget Bureau plans for works of improvement on the following watersheds: San Gabriel River (western area), Calif.; South Fork Blackwater River, Mo.; Indian Wash, Colo.; Mulberry Creek, Tenn.; and Rocky Comfort Creek, Ga.; to Agriculture Committee. p. 5502
Received from the Budget Bureau plans for works of improvement on the following watersheds: North Branch of Forest River (supplemental), N. Dak., and Florence area, Ariz.; to Public Works Committee. p. 5502

REGULATION OF IMPORTS OF AGRICULTURAL COM-
MODITIES AND PRODUCTS

APRIL 4, 1962.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry,
submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany S. 3006]

The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3006) to amend section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956, having considered the same, report thereon with a recommendation that it do pass without amendment.

The bill would authorize the President, for the purpose of carrying out any agreement under section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956, to limit the importation of any agricultural commodity or product covered by such agreement from countries not participating in the agreement.

Section 204 authorizes the President to enter into voluntary agreements with representatives of foreign governments covering the export from such countries and the importation into the United States of any agricultural commodity or product, including textiles or textile products. The only agreement negotiated under the authority of this section and which has become effective is a 1-year cotton textile arrangement in which 16 countries are now participating. A long-term arrangement has also been negotiated by 19 importing and exporting countries and has been submitted to the respective governments for approval. The countries are Australia, Austria, Canada, Denmark, India, Japan, Norway, Pakistan, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, the United Kingdom (also representing Hong Kong), the United States, and the member states of the European Economic Community (Belgium, France, Germany, Italy, Luxembourg, and the Netherlands). These countries cover 90 percent of the free world trade in cotton textiles.

Because section 204 was drafted primarily with bilateral agreements in mind, the existence of necessary power in the President with respect to nonparticipants in a broadly based multilateral agreement is

questionable. S. 3006 would give the President this specific authority, but would be applicable only in the case of agreements where imports from participating countries account for a significant part of the world trade in the article.

Enactment of the legislation was requested in a letter from the Under Secretary of Commerce, dated March 9, 1962, a copy of which is attached. As explained therein, passage of the bill is urgently needed to prevent anticipated imports from nonparticipating countries vitiating the effect of the present agreement and will be necessary to prevent similar action in future arrangements on other commodities. The Departments of State, Agriculture, and Labor also recommend approval of the bill and their reports are attached hereto.

The question was raised in the committee as to whether "agricultural commodity or product" included lumber, which is an important commodity of many States. The committee has generally considered lumber as a product of an agricultural commodity and believes this concept should apply to the provisions of section 204. An opinion by the General Counsel of the Department of Agriculture on the matter is attached.

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C., March 9, 1962.

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Department of Commerce urges the introduction and enactment of the enclosed draft legislation to amend section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956.

Section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 authorized the President to negotiate international agreements relating to the export to and the import by the United States of "any agricultural commodity or product manufactured therefrom or textiles or textile products." Because it was drafted primarily with bilateral agreements in mind, the existence of necessary power in the President with respect to non-participants in a broadly based multilateral agreement is questionable. In both the 1-year cotton textiles arrangement presently in force and the long-term cotton textiles arrangement, expected to come into force with substantially the same participants on October 1, 1962, provisions permit the United States to take action to prevent trade with nonparticipants in the arrangements from frustrating the purposes of the arrangements. Since countries accounting for 90 percent of the free world trade in cotton textiles are participants, the same authority which the President has already been delegated by section 204 should clearly be extended to nonparticipants to prevent the minority of countries which choose to stay out of the arrangements from thereby gaining an advantage over the countries which participate in them.

By the term "significant" in the draft is meant significant to the national interest of the United States. The term "products" is intended to convey the concept of origin; that is, "products of countries" means articles which are the growth, manufacture, or produce of those countries.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that, from the standpoint of the administration's program, there is no objection to the presentation of this legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD GUDEMAN,
Under Secretary of Commerce.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, March 22, 1962.

HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture and Forestry,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am replying to your request of March 17, 1962, for a report on S. 3006, a bill to amend section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956.

The Department of State concurs in the necessity for the enactment of S. 3006. This Department joined with other interested departments in drafting this bill and joins them in urging prompt enactment of it.

The Department of State was engaged, together with other interested departments, in the negotiation of both the short-term and the long-term cotton textile arrangements. The arrangements provided that action could be taken under certain circumstances against non-participants. This bill will confer upon the President the authority needed to implement these provisions.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection from the standpoint of the administration's program to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

FREDERICK G. DUTTON,
Assistant Secretary
(For the Acting Secretary of State).

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, March 22, 1962.

HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture and Forestry,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This refers to your letter of March 17 in which you request a report on S. 3006, a bill to amend section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956.

We favor the enactment of this bill.

Section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 authorizes the President to negotiate international agreements relating to the export to and the import by the United States of "any agricultural commodity or product manufactured therefrom, or textiles or textile products." Because it was drafted primarily with bilateral agreements in mind, the existence of necessary power in the President with respect to nonparticipants in a broadly based multilateral agreement is questionable.

In both the 1-year cotton textiles arrangement presently in force and the long-term cotton textiles arrangement expected to come into

force with substantially the same participants on October 1, 1962, provisions permit the United States to take action to prevent trade with nonparticipants in the arrangements from frustrating the purposes of the arrangements. Since countries accounting for 90 percent of the free world trade in cotton textiles are participants, the same authority which has been given to the President by section 204 should clearly be extended to nonparticipants to prevent the minority of countries that choose to stay out of the arrangements from thereby gaining an advantage over the countries that participate in them.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the presentation of this report from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES S. MURPHY,
Acting Secretary.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, March 21, 1962.

HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR ELLENDER: I am taking this opportunity to set forth the Department of Labor's position on S. 3006, a bill recently referred to your committee which would amend section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956.

As you know, section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 authorizes the President to carry on the negotiation of international agreements limiting the importation into the United States of agricultural commodities including textiles and textile products. Since section 204 was apparently principally intended to enable the President to negotiate on a bilateral basis with respect to these commodities, there is some question as to whether the President can apply similar limits to nonparticipants where broad multilateral agreements are entered into.

The 1-year cotton textiles arrangement presently in force, and also the long-term cotton textiles arrangement expected to come into force on October 1, 1962, have substantially the same participating countries. These arrangements contain provisions permitting the United States to act to prevent trade with nonparticipants from frustrating the design and purpose of the arrangements. Since approximately 90 percent of the free trade in cotton textiles is carried on by the countries participating in these arrangements, we believe that the same authority which the President has under section 204 with respect to participants should be extended to nonparticipants. Such authority would prevent the minority of countries which choose to stay out of arrangements from thus gaining an advantage over participating countries. S. 3006 would vest such authority in the President.

The necessity for resolving the question which presently exists is of obvious importance to the Department of Labor. Particularly, it should be noted that the Interagency Textile Administrative Committee on which this Department is represented has studied the terms of S. 3006, and has recommended its enactment. Accordingly, I urge favorable action on this proposal.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that it has no objection to the presentation of this report from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Yours sincerely,

ARTHUR GOLDBERG,
Secretary of Labor.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL,
Washington, D.C., April 4, 1962.

HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

DEAR SENATOR ELLENDER: Mr. Stanton, counsel for your committee, has informed us that in considering S. 3006, to amend section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 (7 U.S.C. 1854), the question has been raised as to whether the phrase "any agricultural commodity or product manufactured therefrom" includes timber and its products.

Section 204 is as follows:

"The President may, whenever he determines such action appropriate, negotiate with representatives of foreign governments in an effort to obtain agreements limiting the export from such countries and the importation into the United States of any agricultural commodity or product manufactured therefrom or textiles or textile products, and the President is authorized to issue regulations governing the entry or withdrawal from warehouse of any such commodity, product, textiles, or textile products to carry out any such agreement. Nothing herein shall affect the authority provided under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act (of 1933) as amended (7 U.S.C. 1854)."

Although we have not had time to examine the legislative history of this provision exhaustively, our study thus far indicates that such history does not give clear evidence of the intention of the Congress in this respect. In examining this question, therefore, we believe we must first determine the meaning of this phrase as the words therein have been generally construed.

Webster's New International Dictionary, 2d edition, defines agriculture as "The art or science of cultivating the ground, and raising and harvesting crops, often including also feeding, breeding and management of livestock; tillage; husbandry; farming; in a broader sense, the science and art of the production of *plants* and animals *useful to man*, including to a variable extent the preparation of these products for man's use and their disposal by marketing or otherwise. In the broad use it includes farming, horticulture, *forestry*, dairying, sugar making, etc." (Emphasis supplied.)

Court decisions have adopted the foregoing definition of "agriculture" in defining agricultural commodities and products. *United States v. Turner Turpentine Co.* (111 F. 2d 400 (5th Cir. 1940)) involved the issue of whether labor performed in the production of gum from oleoresin by scarification of living pine trees and its processing into gum spirits of turpentine and gum resin was "agricultural labor" as used in the Social Security Act. The Social Security Act of 1935, as it read before the 1939 Amendments, was the law before the court in this case and the term "agricultural labor" was not defined. In

holding that Congress intended the term to have a comprehensive meaning so as to include tree products, the court said at page 404:

"When then, Congress in passing an act like the Social Security Act uses, in laying down a broad general policy of exclusion, a term of as general import as 'agricultural labor,' it must be considered that it used the term in a sense and intended it to have a meaning wide enough and broad enough to cover and embrace agricultural labor of any and every kind, as that term is understood in the various sections of the United States where the act operates. This does not mean, of course, that a mere local custom, which is in the face of the meaning of a general term used in an act, may be read into the act to vary its terms. It does mean, however, that when a word or term intended to have general application in an activity as broad as agriculture, has a wide meaning, it must be interpreted broadly enough to embrace in it all the kinds and forms of agriculture practiced where it operates, that its generality reasonably extends to. Definitions of "agriculture" in standard texts and treatises and in decisions in these latter years have had the widest content. Funk & Wagnalls defines "agriculture" as including horticulture, fruit raising, etc., 'because agriculture is the science that treats of the cultivation of the soil.' Webster's Unabridged Dictionary, 1935, declares that in a broader sense agriculture includes farming, horticulture, forestry, dairying, sugarmaking, etc. The Encyclopedia Britannica, 14th edition, 'Forestry as a Science,' declares: 'the science underlying the growing of timber crops is therefore nothing but a branch of general plant science,' while the Cyclopedia of American Agriculture says of forests, 'if agriculture is the raising of products from the land, then forestry is a part of agriculture' (vol. 2, p. 312). From the Encyclopedia Britannica article, on rosin production, we quote the following significant passage: 'The chief region of rosin production is the South Atlantic and Eastern Gulf States of the United States. American rosin is obtained from the turpentine of the swamp pine and of the loblolly pine. The main source of supply in Europe is the lands of the departments of Gironde and Landes in France, *where the cluster pine is extensively cultivated.*' (Italic supplied.) An examination of the cases cited in 'Words and Phrases,' fifth series, volume 1, page 339 et seq., under agriculture and in 3 C.J.S., 'Agriculture,' pages 361, 365, and 366, section 1, under 'agricultural' and 'agriculture,' convinces that in modern usage this is a wide and comprehensive term and that statutes using it without qualification must be given an equally comprehensive meaning."

The *Turner Turpentine Co.* case was followed in *Stuart v. Kleck* (129 F. 2d 400 (9th Cir. 1942)), which also involved the definition of "agricultural labor" as used in the Social Security Act. In the following cases the courts adopted definitions of "products of the land," "agriculture," "agricultural purposes," "agricultural commodities," "agricultural products," or "agricultural labor," some as used in statutes, in the broad sense of things which are the result of husbandry and the cultivation of the soil (*Sancho v. Bowie*, 93 F. 2d 323 (1st Cir. 1937); *Lowe v. North Dakota Workman's Compensation Bureau*, 220 Wis. 701, 264 N.W. 837 (1936); *Forsythe v. Village of Cooksville*, 356 Ill. 289, 190 N.E. 421 (1934); *In Re Rogers*, 134 Neb. 832, 279 N.W. 800 (1938); *Getty v. C. R. Barnes Milling Co.*, 40 Kan. 281, 19 Pac. 617 (1888); *Florida Industrial Comm'n v. Growers Equipment Co.*, 152 Fla. 595, 12 So. 2d 889 (1943)).

Congress has recognized that the term "agricultural commodities" may include forest products. Section 207 of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 1091; 7 U.S.C. 1626) defines "agricultural products" to include "agricultural, horticultural, viticultural, and dairy products, livestock and poultry, bees, *forest products*, fish and shellfish, and any products thereof, including processed and manufactured products, and any and all products raised or produced on farms and any processed and manufactured products thereof." (Emphasis supplied.)

Section 518 of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (55 Stat. 256; as amended, 7 U.S.C. 1518), defines "agricultural commodity" as "wheat, cotton, flax, corn, dry beans, oats, barley, rye, tobacco, rice, peanuts, soybeans, sugarbeets, sugarcane, *timber and forests*, potatoes and other vegetables, citrus and other fruits, tame hay, * * *" (Emphasis supplied.)

Section 2 of the act of May 9, 1956 (70 Stat. 133; 12 U.S.C. 1841 (g)), concerning bank holding companies, defines "agriculture" to include "farming in all its branches including fruitgrowing, dairying, the raising of livestock, bees, fur-bearing animals, or poultry, *forestry or lumbering operations*, and the production of naval stores, and operations directly related thereto." (Emphasis supplied.)

Section 1 of the act of March 4, 1927 (44 Stat. 1423; as amended, 15 U.S.C. 431), concerning discrimination against farmers' cooperative associations by boards of trade, states that "agricultural products" "means agricultural, horticultural, viticultural, and dairy products, food products of livestock, the products of poultry and bee raising, *the edible products of forestry*, and any and all products raised or produced on farms and processed or manufactured products thereof, transported or intended to be transported in interstate and/or foreign commerce." (Emphasis supplied.)

Section 3 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (52 Stat. 1060; as amended, 29 U.S.C. 203(f)), defines "agriculture" to include "farming in all its branches and among other things includes the cultivation and tillage of the soil, dairying, the production, cultivation, growing, and harvesting of any agricultural or horticultural commodities (including commodities defined as agricultural commodities in section 1141j(g) of Title 12), the raising of livestock, bees, fur-bearing animals, or poultry, and any practices (*including any forestry or lumbering operations*) performed by a farmer or on a farm as an incident to or in conjunction with such farming operations, including preparation for market, delivery to storage or to market or to carriers for transportation to market." (Emphasis supplied.)

The present social security tax law, now known as the Federal Unemployment Tax Act, has an extensive definition of "agricultural labor," which includes expressly only some forest products such as naval stores (68A Stat. 447; 26 U.S.C. 3306(k)).

As may be seen, some of the definitions, for the immediate purposes involved in the legislation, include forestry products only in part. However, we believe even in these instances, this serves as an indication that where the terms "agricultural commodities" or "products thereof" are used without qualification it is reasonable to include timber in the concept.

We believe that in the historical development of public attention to the timber resources of this Nation the concept has long been that

the growing of trees and the work of forestation and reforestation is a part of agriculture. It also appears to be a necessary corollary that timber is an agricultural commodity and that lumber is a product of such commodity. We have found a number of instances both past and present where this concept is expressed. We will quote a few of these.

In an annual report of the Secretary of the Interior (Ethan Allen Hitchcock) in 1901 the following is stated:¹

"The keynote of the administration of the forest reserves should be to increase the value of the reserves to the public and to perpetuate their forests by wise use * * * Forestry, dealing as it does with a source of wealth produced by the soil, is properly an agricultural subject."

Gifford Pinchot, Chief of the Bureau of Forestry in the Department of Agriculture in 1902, in a statement before the Agricultural Committee of the House, declared:

"Forestry is a component part of agriculture. Every source of wealth grown from the soil is in the sphere of the Department of Agriculture; hence the forest work rightly belongs to it. The production of timber is as naturally within the scope of the Department of Agriculture as is the production of field crops."

Secretary of Agriculture D. F. Houston, in a letter to the chairman of the Public Lands Committee of the Senate, June 24, 1918, stated:

"This Department is charged with the task of stimulating and improving the production of all forms of wealth grown from the soil. A forest is a crop and forestry is primarily a problem of production from the soil."

Secretary of Agriculture E. T. Meredith, in an annual report to the President dated November 15, 1921, stated:

"The Bureau of Crop Estimates secures information on the needs of stockmen and farmers for public and national forest ranges which aids the national forest administration, and collects also data on the products of farm woodlots which is of value in the development of farm forestry. In short, having largely exhausted the forest crop grown in advance, the problem now is to use more widely what remains and to grow other crops to meet our needs. That is to say, forestry is a distinctly agricultural business. The function of the Department as a whole includes efforts for the production of the most effective manufacture, distribution, and utilization of the products of both farm and forest for the benefit of the country at large."

President Franklin D. Roosevelt in a letter to the Joint Committee on Forestry of the Congress declared:²

"Forests are intimately tied into our whole social and economic life. They grow on more than one-third the land area of the continental United States. Wages from forest industries support 5 to 6 million people each year. Forests give us building materials and thousands of other things in everyday use. Forest lands furnish food and shelter for much of our remaining game, and healthful recreation for millions of our people. Forests help prevent erosion and floods. They conserve water and regulate its use for navigation, for power, for domestic use, and for irrigation. Woodlands occupy more

¹ Some of the following quotations have been derived from a collected document which is authentic. Time has not permitted review of the original sources.

² Mar. 14, 1938, Report of the Joint Committee on Forestry, Senate Doc. No. 32, 77th Cong., 1st sess.

acreage than any other crop on American farms, and help support 2½ million families.

"Our forest problem is essentially one of land use. It is a part of the broad problem of modern agriculture that is common to every part of the country. Forest lands total some 615 million acres."

In testifying in 1951 on S. 1149, a bill to reorganize the Department of Agriculture, Lyle F. Watts, Chief of the Forest Service, stated:³

"Forestry and grazing are agricultural functions.—Trees and grass are crops. Like corn, wheat, and cotton they start from seed. They respond to the same kind of care given other crops. They are harvested—or at least they should be harvested—so that one crop follows another. Their culture is based on the biological sciences, which are chiefly and in many cases exclusively the concern of the Department of Agriculture. Insect and plant-disease control, genetics, soil science, and other agricultural sciences are as important to growing crops of trees and grass as they are to field crops.

* * * * *

"Forestry and grazing are inseparable parts of agriculture. It takes the same know-how to grow timber in the farmer's woods as it does in forests owned by anyone else. Farm woodlands are indispensable to the Nation's timber supply. Farmers own one-third of all our commercial forest land—139 million acres.

"Turning it around, woodlands are indispensable to the farmer. Forest lands make up half the total farm acreage in New England and about 40 percent of all farm acreage in the South. Forest products provide farmers in many regions with a valuable source of cash income. When forest land is properly managed, the timber harvest can be as regular and dependable as any other crop.

"Farm forestry is an integral part of the Department's farm program. Farmers look to the Department of Agriculture for help on farm forestry just as they do in animal husbandry, fruitgrowing, or other crop problems. The small nonfarm forest properties of 125 million acres, almost as extensive as the farm forests and often intermingled with them, face exactly the same problems and should be served by the same agency.

* * * * *

"Nor can any sharp line be drawn between forestry and grazing. In much of the South and West the same land is used to grow both trees and grass. Thus all such lands are interrelated parts of the Nation's agricultural enterprise.

"And from the watershed angle, forest and grazing lands are inseparably linked with field-crop lands. In every watershed, we must have a unified approach covering all lands to effectively control erosion, floods, and water supply. Soil conservation and watershed management are agriculture, and the Department of Agriculture, under the Flood Control Act of 1936, is responsible for watershed surveys on all lands. Within the Department, the Forest Service and the Soil Conservation Service work together closely to reduce damage from floods and sedimentation on forest, grazing, and other crop lands.

³ Hearings before the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, U.S. Senate, 82d Cong., 1st sess., p. 442.

"Adding it all up, any way you look at it, the answer is the same: Forestry and grazing are agriculture."

It is, therefore, our opinion that forestry is a part of agriculture and that timber is an agricultural commodity. It follows, therefore, that the products thereof, such as lumber, are products within the definition in section 204. We have attempted to analyze the problem from the standpoint of general precedent and authority. If the foregoing analysis is not consistent with the present intent and purposes of the Congress, you may wish to reexamine the question for greater clarification.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN C. BAGWELL,
General Counsel.

○

87TH CONGRESS
2^D SESSION

S. 3006

[Report No. 1324]

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

MARCH 16 (legislative day, MARCH 14), 1962

Mr. ELLENDER (by request) introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

APRIL 4, 1962

Reported by Mr. ELLENDER, without amendment

A BILL

To amend section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 is amended
4 by inserting the following after the first sentence thereof:
5 “In addition, if a multilateral agreement has been or shall be
6 concluded under the authority of this section among coun-
7 tries accounting for a significant part of world trade in the
8 articles with respect to which the agreement was concluded,
9 the President may also issue, in order to carry out such an
10 agreement, regulations governing the entry or withdrawal
11 from warehouse of the same articles which are the products
12 of countries not parties to the agreement.”

87TH CONGRESS
2D Session

S. 3006

[Report No. 1324]

A BILL

To amend section 204 of the Agricultural Act
of 1956.

By Mr. ELLENDER

MARCH 16 (legislative day, MARCH 14), 1962

Read twice and referred to the Committee on
Agriculture and Forestry

APRIL 4, 1962

Reported without amendment

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF
BUDGET AND FINANCE

(For information only;
should not be quoted
or cited)

Issued April 6, 1962
For actions of April 5, 1962
87th-2d, No. 53

CONTENTS

| | | |
|----------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|
| Acreage allotments.....3 | Cotton.....3 | Milk.....23 |
| Adjournment.....8,17 | Farm program.....1,31 | Peace Corps.....15,18 |
| Appropriations..7,13,16,22 | Flood insurance.....5 | Personnel.....10 |
| ASC committees.....10,19 | Foreign trade.....2,7,25 | Purchasing.....4 |
| Budget.....24 | Forestry.....11,28 | River basin.....16 |
| Buildings.....30 | Grain.....20 | Small business.....26 |
| Bulk commodities.....9 | Imports.....7,29 | Taxation.....27 |
| Civil defense.....14 | Lands.....21,28 | Textiles.....2 |
| Claims.....13 | Legislative program.....7 | Transportation.....6,9 |
| Contracts.....4 | Manpower development....16 | Watersheds.....12 |

HIGHLIGHTS: House committee approved wheat section of farm bill. Both Houses received President's transportation message. House Rules Committee cleared bill for agricultural import restrictions on nonparticipating countries in multilateral trade agreements. Sen. Williams, Del., criticized ASC committee meeting in Washington.

HOUSE

- 1. FARM PROGRAM.** The "Daily Digest" states that the Agriculture Committee "Met in executive session and approved the wheat section (amended) of H. R. 10010, the general farm bill." p. D245
- 2. FOREIGN TRADE.** The Rules Committee reported a resolution for the consideration of H. R. 10788, to amend section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 to authorize the President to regulate imports of agricultural commodities, including textiles and textile products, from agreements. p. 5550
Passed as reported H. R. 6682, to provide for the exemption of fowling nets from duty. pp. 5506-7
Rep. Derounian inserted a statement by the Man-Made Fiber Producers Association, Inc. in opposition to H. R. 9900, the proposed Trade Expansion Act of 1962. pp. 5542-9

3. COTTON. Passed without amendment H. R. 11027, to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 so as to extend to the 1962 crop the authority to permit operators of farms with flooded-out cotton acreage to transfer cotton acreage allotments to another farm operated by the same farmer in the same or an adjoining county. p. 5508
4. PURCHASING. The Education and Labor Committee reported without amendment H. R. 10786, to establish standards for hours of work and overtime pay of laborers and mechanics employed on work done under contract for, or with the financial aid of, the U. S. for any territory (H. Rept. 1553), and H. R. 10946, to amend the Davis-Bacon Act to define the term "wages" as used in the Act (H. Rept. 1554). p. 5550
5. FLOOD INSURANCE. Rep. Wallhauser inserted a resolution from the New Jersey legislature memorializing Congress to enact legislation to implement the Federal Flood Insurance Act of 1956. p. 5534
6. TRANSPORTATION. Rep. Harris discussed the President's transportation message, and inserted a statement regarding the 75th anniversary of the ICC. pp. 5515-6
Rep. Van Zandt discussed the transportation message, saying, "Although some of us may disagree as to detail, we would all agree ... with the central thesis of the President's message." pp. 5533-4
7. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Rep. Albert announced that H. R. 10788, to amend section 204 of the Agriculture Act of 1956 relating to the regulation of agricultural and textile imports will be considered on Tues., Apr. 10, and the legislative appropriation bill for 1963 on Wed., Apr. 11. p. 5532
8. ADJOURNED until Mon., Apr. 9. p. 5550

SENATE

9. TRANSPORTATION. Both Houses received the President's message on transportation in which he recommended removal of the exemption from rate regulation by ICC of the transportation of bulk commodities by water carriers; recommended extension to all carriers (rather than only to motor carriers and freight forwarders) the exemption from minimum rates for the transportation of agricultural and fishery products; proposed legislation to assure all carriers the right to ship vehicles or containers on the carriers of other branches of the transportation industry at the same rates available to noncarrier shippers, to repeal the provision of the Interstate Commerce Act which prevents a railroad from hauling cargo it owns, and to direct the regulatory agencies to sanction experimental freight rates, modifications and variations in existing systems of classification and documentation, and new kinds or combinations of service; stated that he was directing Federal agencies, in meeting their own transport needs, to use authorized commercial facilities in all modes of transportation within the limits of economical and efficient operations; urged that Congress declare as a matter of public policy that through rates and joint rates should be vigorously encouraged and authorize all transportation agencies to participate in joint boards; recommended that all common carriers, including freight forwarders and motor carriers, be required to pay reparations to shippers charged unlawfully high rates; recommended that the civil penalty now imposed on motor carriers for failure to file required reports be substantially increased; stated that he had directed

CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 10788

APRIL 5, 1962.—Referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed

Mr. ELLIOTT, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following

R E P O R T

[To accompany H. Res. 589]

The Committee on Rules, having had under consideration House Resolution 589, report the same to the House with the recommendation that the resolution do pass.





House Calendar No. 201

87TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. RES. 589

[Report No. 1555]

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

APRIL 5, 1962

Mr. ELLIOTT, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following resolution:
which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed

RESOLUTION

1 *Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it
2 shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into
3 the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union
4 for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10788) to amend sec-
5 tion 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956. After general
6 debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue
7 not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled
8 by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Com-
9 mittee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment
10 under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consid-
11 eration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise
12 and report the bill to the House with such amendments as

1 may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be
2 considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to
3 final passage without intervening motion except one motion
4 to recommit.

House Calendar No. 401

87TH CONGRESS
2d Session

H. RES. 589

[Report No. 1555]

RESOLUTION

Providing for the consideration of H.R. 10788,
a bill to amend section 204 of the Agricultural
Act of 1956.

By Mr. ELLIOTT

APRIL 5, 1962

Referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be
printed

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OFFICE OF
BUDGET AND FINANCE

(For information only;
should not be quoted
or cited)

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Issued April 11, 1962
For actions of April 10, 1962
87th-2d, No. 55

CONTENTS

| | | |
|---------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Acreage allotments.....7 | Highways.....25 | Research.....23 |
| Cotton.....7 | Information.....24 | Retirement.....14 |
| Disaster relief.....27 | Lands.....13 | Roads.....25 |
| Easter recess.....15 | Legislative program.....15 | Soil conservation.....4 |
| Electrification.....11 | Manpower training.....16 | Textiles.....2 |
| Export control.....10 | Marketing orders.....1 | Transportation.....6,21 |
| Farm program.....1,8,22 | Milk quotas.....17 | Unemployment.....20 |
| Foreign currencies.....5 | Peace Corps.....15 | Unemployment compensation.....12 |
| Foreign trade.....2,10,18 | Personnel.....14,28 | Wool.....9 |
| Grain storage.....19 | REA.....24 | Youth conservation.....26 |
| Health benefits.....28 | Reclamation.....3 | |

HIGHLIGHTS: House committee approved marketing order provisions of farm bill. House began debate on bill for agricultural import restrictions on nonparticipating countries in multilateral trade agreements. Senate committee reported bill for transfer of cotton allotments on flooded acreage. Sen. McNamara introduced and discussed road bill.

HOUSE

- 1. FARM PROGRAM.** The "Daily Digest" states that the Agriculture Committee "Met in executive session and approved title III (a) regarding marketing orders of H. R. 10010, the general farm bill." p. D266
- 2. FOREIGN TRADE.** Began debate on H. R. 10788, to amend section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 to authorize the President to extend import-export controls to non-participants in multilateral agreements regarding agricultural commodities or products or textiles or products. pp. 5666-79
Rejected the following amendments:
 - By Rep. Findley, to extend this authority to all agreements, instead of limiting it to multilateral agreements only. p. 5677
 - By Rep. Gross, to require multilateral agreements in beef and beef products, pork and pork products, fresh and frozen lamb, poultry and poultry products, and dairy products before such agreements can be enforced in regard to cotton textiles; by a 46-76 vote. pp. 5678-9

Rejected an amendment by Rep. Findley to provide that section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 shall expire after June 30, 1963. p. 5679

Rep. Clem Miller inserted two statements by producers on the effects of the proposed Trade Expansion Act of 1962 on our agricultural trade and said, "It is essential our products not be discriminated against." pp. 5708-9

3. RECLAMATION. The Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee voted to report to the full committee H. R. 9252, to defer the collection or irrigation maintenance and operation charges for calendar year 1962 on lands within the Angostura unit, Missouri River Basin project, and, with amendments, H. R. 23, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Arbuckle reclamation project, Okla. p. D266
4. SOIL CONSERVATION. The Judiciary Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) S. Con. Res. 62, to commemorate the 25th anniversary of the establishment of soil conservation districts. p. D266
5. FOREIGN CURRENCIES. Received from the Banking and Currency Committee a supplemental report on the expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds for travel outside the U. S. p. 5710
6. TRANSPORTATION. Rep. Sibal commended various recommendations in the President's transportation message. p. 5704

SENATE

7. COTTON. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported without amendment H. R. 11027, to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 so as to extend to the 1962 crop the authority of the Secretary to permit operators of farms with flooded-out cotton acreage to transfer cotton acreage allotments to another farm operated by the farmer in the same or an adjoining county (S. Rept. 1327). p. 5726
8. FARM PROGRAM. The "Daily Digest" states that the Agriculture and Forestry Committee "continued its consideration of S. 2786, proposed Food and Agriculture Act of 1962, and tentatively adopted perfecting amendments to title I of the bill, relating to land-use adjustment, but did not conclude action thereon, and will meet again tomorrow." p. D263
Sen. Carlson inserted the minutes of a meeting of a group of Greeley County, Kan., farmers favoring changes in the wheat and feed grain programs. p. 5734
9. WOOL. Sen. McGee inserted a report by Prof. Glenn Roehrkas, Univ. of Wyoming, on the economic value of the Wyo. sheep and wool industry to the economy of Wyo. pp. 5736-7
10. EXPORT CONTROL. Both Houses received from Commerce a proposed bill "to provide for continuation of authority for regulation of exports"; to S. and H. Banking and Currency Committees. pp. 5711, 5723
11. ELECTRIFICATION. Received from Interior a proposed bill "to guarantee electric consumers in the Pacific Northwest first call on electric energy generated at Federal plants in that region and to guarantee electric consumers in other regions reciprocal priority"; to Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. p. 5723



United States
of America

Please return to
Division of Legislative Reporting
Office of Budget and Finance

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 87th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 108

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, APRIL 10, 1962

No. 55

House of Representatives

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Micah 7: 7: Therefore I will look unto the Lord; my God will hear me.

O Thou who canst lift us out of weakness into power and out of weariness into peace, may we daily be blessed with the faith that will make us faithful.

Grant that we may seek diligently and covet earnestly Thy divine wisdom and strength for the duties and responsibilities of our high calling.

Inspire us with devotion and dedication to that which is noble and true in order that we may have within our hearts the throb and thrill of Thy joy which the world cannot give or take away.

Endow us with that magnanimous and sacrificial spirit of our Saviour who never spared Himself in the great mission of giving to needy humanity the morning wonder and glory of a new day.

Hear us in His name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 205) entitled "An act to expedite the utilization of television transmission facilities in our public schools and colleges, and in adult training programs," agrees to the conference requested by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. MONROE, Mr. COTTON, and Mr. CASE of New Jersey to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

CENSURE OF ISRAEL

(Mr. FARBSTAIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FARBSTAIN. Mr. Speaker, the Security Council of the United Nations has voted to censure Israel for its part

in last month's Lake Tiberius incident on the basis of a U.S. introduced and actively supported resolution.

This resolution was introduced despite clear evidence that Syrian guns had fired first upon Israel shipping in clearly recognized Israel waters and that the shooting was repeated despite Israel's complaints to U.N. truce supervisors.

The U.S. delegation to the U.N. pressed vigorously for a one-sided vote of censure in the face of disputed testimony by Maj. Gen. Carl C. Von Horn, Chief of Staff of the U.N. Truce Supervision Organization, regarding the presence of Syrian fortifications along the Israel-Syrian frontier.

Israel has presented facts to indicate a heavy buildup of Soviet-made weapons by Syrian forces along the frontier area which gives rise to a question of alternate Syrian intentions against Israel.

The unilateral condemnation of Israel leaves unpunished Syria's hostile actions, and could serve as an open invitation to Syria to resume its harassment of Israel shipping. It can only lead to a further aggravation of an already tense situation.

The United States has repeatedly and firmly expressed its support and deep commitment to an effective peace in the Middle East.

Therefore, I am today introducing a resolution requesting the Secretary of State to furnish to the House of Representatives, at the earliest practicable date, full and complete information with respect to the motivation, and underlying reasons, for the sponsorship by this country and support before the Security Council of the U.N. of the censure of Israel which occurred on April 9, 1962.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be permitted to sit this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

CORRECTION OF THE RECORD

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, in an Appendix insertion, "The Stars and Stripes—a Tribute," on April 3, 1962, page A2522, the author is identified as "Mrs. Rudolph M. Bowman."

The author of this fine tribute is Mr. Rudolph M. Bowman. I ask unanimous consent that the proper changes, from "Mrs." to "Mr." in the first three paragraphs of the insertion, be made for the permanent Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

CORRECTION OF ROLL CALL

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, on roll call No. 62, I am recorded as not voting. I was present and voted "nay." I ask unanimous consent that the permanent Record and Journal be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 63]

| | | |
|----------------|---------------|----------------|
| Anderson, Ill. | Coad | Harrison, Va. |
| Andrews | Collier | Harvey, Mich. |
| Anfuso | Curtis, Mass. | Healey |
| Barrett | Dawson | Hébert |
| Battin | Derwinski | Hoffman, Ill. |
| Blitch | Dingell | Hoffman, Mich. |
| Boykin | Dooley | Holifield |
| Breeding | Dowdy | Huddleston |
| Brewster | Dwyer | Jarman |
| Buckley | Fascell | Jennings |
| Cahill | Finnegan | Jones, Ala. |
| Casey | Flynt | Kee |
| Celler | Fulton | Kelly |
| Chelf | Gavin | Kitchin |
| Church | Grant | Kluczynski |

| | | |
|---------------|---------------|----------------|
| Lankford | Patman | Selden |
| Libonati | Powell | Shelley |
| Macdonald | Pucinski | Smith, Miss. |
| Michel | Rains | Spence |
| Miner, | Rhodes, Ariz. | Steed |
| George P. | Roberts, Ala. | Thompson, N.J. |
| Moulder | Roosevelt | Van Pelt |
| Murphy | Rostenkowski | Walter |
| Nedzi | Rousselot | Whitten |
| Nix | St. Germain | Wilson, Ind. |
| O'Brien, Ill. | Schwengel | Yates |
| O'Hara, Ill. | Scott | Zelenko |

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and fifty-six members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

REGULATION OF TEXTILE IMPORTS

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 589 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10788) to amend section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommend.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require, after which I will yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

[Mr. ELLIOTT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman tell me why this bill is limited to cotton and cotton textiles when there are many other industries that are just as seriously affected by imports as is cotton and the cotton industry?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I will say to the gentleman that I think it might be better that his question be directed to a member of the legislative committee that had the bill under its jurisdiction. This bill deals with the cotton and textile industries. Perhaps there should be other bills dealing with other industries.

(Mr. BROWN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT], a member of the Committee on Rules, has adequately explained the provisions of this rule, so I shall not discuss them further at this

time. Instead, I would like to discuss this legislation and its background, if I may.

In the beginning may I say that as one who has always believed that some tariffs and export duties were necessary in order to protect American industry and labor from unfair foreign competition; as one who has consistently voted against the extension of the so-called Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, which is not reciprocal in any sense of the word, and under which we have seen a great many industries and a great deal of American labor injured as the result of agreements made under that act; and as one who has watched with alarm and concern the arrangement that was made some time ago to permit certain foreign countries to purchase surplus owned—

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 64]

| | | |
|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Anderson, Ill. | Flynt | Murphy |
| Andrews | Fulton | Nedzi |
| Anfuso | Gavin | Nix |
| Auchincloss | Grant | O'Brien, Ill. |
| Barrett | Hansen | O'Hara, Ill. |
| Battin | Harding | Patman |
| Blitch | Harrison, Va. | Pfost |
| Boykin | Harsha | Philbin |
| Breeding | Harvey, Mich. | Powell |
| Brewster | Healey | Pucinski |
| Buckley | Hébert | Rains |
| Cahill | Hoffman, Ill. | Rhodes, Ariz. |
| Cannon | Hoffman, Mich. | Roberts, Ala. |
| Casey | Huddleston | Roosevelt |
| Celler | Jarman | Rosen, Ill. |
| Chelf | Jennings | Rostenkowski |
| Church | Jones, Ala. | St. Germain |
| Coad | Kastenmeier | Schwengel |
| Collier | Kee | Scott |
| Colmer | Kelly | Selden |
| Curtis, Mass. | Kitchin | Shelley |
| Dawson | Kluczynski | Smith, Miss. |
| Deryniski | Lankford | Spence |
| Diggs | Libonati | Staggers |
| Dingell | McCulloch | Teague, Tex. |
| Donohue | Madden | Thompson, N.J. |
| Dooley | Michel | Van Pelt |
| Dowdy | Miller | Walter |
| Downing | George P. | Whitten |
| Dwyer | Moeller | Wilson, Ind. |
| Fallon | Morrison | Yates |
| Fascell | Moulder | |

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and forty-three Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

REGULATION OF TEXTILE IMPORTS

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] is recognized.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, to resume the remarks I was making at the time a quorum call proceedings interrupted me, let me say, I have been gravely concerned over the arrangement which has been in effect some time under which we were selling our Government-owned

surplus cotton to textile manufacturers in foreign countries for 8½ cents a pound less than American manufacturers of textiles could purchase the same cotton here at home.

I have always believed that was wrong—I still believe it to be wrong, and it is my understanding that this legislation is designed to help correct that situation.

I have noticed throughout the years under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act that quite too often, and I believe it includes the cotton textile industry, that when some injured or aggrieved industry complained and asked for relief from the Tariff Commission from certain agreements that had been made with foreign countries relative to the importation of foreign products that quite often the Tariff Commission would grant the relief requested, and then the matter would go to the President.

As I understand it, usually upon the advice and counsel of the Department of State, the rulings or the decisions of the Tariff Commission would be set aside, and you all know the effect. It was usually done upon the proposition, or upon the basis, or under the argument, that to take such action to protect American labor and industry might make some foreign country, some foreign government, some foreign manufacturer unhappy, perhaps even angry at the United States, and that the people of that foreign country would no longer love us, as some seemingly think we must make everyone do, rather than to respect us.

So I can understand fully why, a few months ago, under the leadership of that very skilled parliamentarian and legislative tactician, the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. VINSON, Members of this body from the cotton-producing States, from the States that have great cotton textile industries located in them, organized to endeavor to see what could be done to relieve them of this unfair foreign competition arrangement, so as to protect the textile industries here in this country. That occurred, of course, about the time, if my memory serves me correctly, the President was sending to the Congress a message on foreign trade in which he was requesting, in spite of the fact that under the reciprocal trade agreements we had on the average reduced import duties and tariffs on foreign products coming into this country by about 75 percent, that Congress give him authority to reduce tariffs by another 50 percent, and in some instances to eliminate them entirely. So it has been quite a coincidence that a peculiar situation has developed here recently in connection with this legislation. So, all of a sudden, after this a great protest swelled up—and I think rightfully so—under the leadership of the gentleman from Georgia, against what was being done to the textile industry as a result of such unfair foreign competition, under this arrangement whereby American Government-owned surplus cotton could be purchased by foreign manufacturers at 8½ cents a pound less than the American manufacturers could purchase the same cotton here in this country.

As a result of all this, somehow or other, the administration began to take a great interest in the cotton textile industry, and the problem was taken up by GATT at Geneva. I have seen and read with a great deal of interest the reports made by our own departments here as to just what was said and done there. Rather peculiarly, if the information I receive is correct, the reports we get of what went on at GATT, as to the agreement that was made with some 18 foreign countries making textiles that come in such increased volume into this country, have not been exactly the same, in wording, intent, or purpose, as the claimed understanding of the other nations that participated in that Conference.

But that is not all. Some other peculiar situations have also developed. This bill came in, as you know, with administration support, on March 15.

It was reported out of the Committee on Agriculture—on March 27, after some very short hearings which were held on March 22. It just happens, you know, that while this bill was reported on the 27th, the so-called administration-sponsored tax bill came to the floor of the House on the 28th of March.

I have read with a great deal of interest—it was just a sort of happenstance of course, but a peculiar sort of situation—that in the report the Assistant Secretary of State for the Acting Secretary of State, on page 3 of the report, under date of March 22, suddenly reversed the position that had been taken by the State Department for so many years, by our Federal Government, by the administration, by the White House, and came out for a protective tariff on cotton textiles. Believe it or not, that is the old McKinley doctrine. If you remember, sometimes some of us who want to protect American industry and labor from unfair foreign competition are called McKinleyites because we are for needed protective tariffs. It is very peculiar, it is quite different, of course. But suddenly, one week before the new tax bill that the administration sponsored came to the floor for consideration the State Department, through the Assistant Secretary of State speaking for the Secretary of State, comes out and endorses this protective tariff bill. The administration now says "you must enact this legislation in order to give proper protection to the cotton textile industry."

Rather peculiar, is it not, that the report on this bill was ordered printed on March 27 just the day before the tax bill was called up. Just a happenstance, of course, just a peculiar coincidence, but they tell me that on that same morning of the 28th, and on the morning of the 29th, and all day long both days, when the tax bill was before the House, there were a great many telephone calls from the Southland. So many, I understand, the phone companies may pay an extra dividend because of the business generated by certain leaders in the textile industry and in the cotton-producing sections of that part of the country, calling Members of Congress, to them to vote for the new tax bill because "we have legislation pending in which we are greatly

interested. We are sure we will have administration support for that legislation." Of course they were referring to this bill now before us.

I can not say whether all of those things are exactly so or not, but they fit into a pattern, do they not, a peculiar pattern? Just a happenstance, of course that these events all fall in line, one after the other, like dominoes which fall over when you push them. Of course all we have to do is to look at the RECORD of March 28 and 29 to see how effective this type of activity had been to influence another legislative decision, and to help mold House action.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. If we pass this New Frontier bill, evidently it has the blessing of the White House as well as the State Department, does the gentleman think it would be unfair for the endorsers of this legislation that they might be called isolationists?

Mr. BROWN. I do not know. But they might be accused of being followers of William McKinley.

Mr. GROSS. He was known as an isolationist, was he not?

Mr. BROWN. I would not say exactly that, because he did do a few things which were not in that direction, but he did put the best interests of this Republic ahead of those of other countries. Rather peculiarly, I also understand that some of the opposition from some of Members from the oil States to the tax bill may have disappeared after some similar understandings were reached as to what might be done relative to the importation of foreign oil into this country. But I do not know; I cannot say, that any deal has been made. Oh, I hate to think anyone would resort to dealing in politics, dealing for votes, but I do say that somehow or other a great many votes were changed on one side of the aisle very suddenly. I do say I have had a number of Members of this body tell me they had been approached to change their position on the tax legislation because of the sudden and urgent request from certain interests in their section of the country. So all of this is rather peculiar, is it not, if you just check the dates and the actions that have been taken all around on this legislation now before us. The charges are still going out over the grapevine telegraph that deals have been made to get a great block of votes for certain administration bills in return for administration support for this cotton textile bill. I did not sit in on any conferences which may have been held. But, I do want to congratulate the very able and distinguished parliamentary leader, the old veteran of this House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], for again doing an effective job of gaining his way in obtaining proper protection, as he believes it, I am sure, for the textile industries in his own section of the country.

May I express the hope, whenever we get to the place it may be necessary

for some of us in the minority to ask for proper protection from unfair foreign competition for our own industries in our own sections of the country, that we may have the same united support from the gentlemen on the right-hand side of the aisle that the gentleman from Georgia has been able to get in connection with this whole matter.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Well, this bill did not take a trip to the rose garden, did it?

Mr. BROWN. I am not sure who has been in the rose garden, but this bill has not come out smelling like a rose.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. The gentleman knows that there are many other commodities besides textiles that are being adversely affected by unfair tariff rates under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, and that the House Committee on Ways and Means is presently considering that whole problem? Why, if what the gentleman says is true, has this particular commodity been singled out?

Mr. BROWN. The gentleman will have to judge that for himself, if he looks at the record a bit but he may determine there was quite a change in position on trade policies made very recently, at a very strategic moment, as far as certain legislation before this House has been concerned.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this rule because this bill has not received proper consideration and, as a matter of fact, this whole issue—and this is a very broad and important issue—is presently before the Committee on Ways and Means. Secretary of Commerce Hodges was testifying before us just this morning, and we will go back this afternoon and get further testimony from him. He made the statement at the time that the reason he did not state anything about this in his March 12 testimony before the Committee on Ways and Means was that he did not know about it. His attention was called to the Department of Commerce letter in the committee report dated March 9. The whole section 204 is a very broad one. It does not affect just agricultural products; it is anything that is made from agricultural products and it includes textiles, which just does not mean textiles out of cotton but man-made fibers.

President Kennedy has said the trade legislation now pending before the Ways and Means Committee is one of the most important things in setting our foreign economic policy to come before us in a decade. I agree with him. This section 204 should be repealed. Certainly. It certainly should not be amended to broaden its powers or gut anything we in the Ways and Means Committee do in this field of reciprocal trade.

Mr. Speaker, we spelled out very carefully in that act the peril-point procedures, the escape-clause procedures, and industries affected by defense. In the present bill before the Ways and Means Committee some 40 pages deal with trade adjustments to take care of alleged injury through foreign imports. This section 204 makes a joke out of all this. What does section 204 say as far as an industry is concerned that has a case to present to present its case? What machinery does it have compared to these other techniques? It says, as follows:

The President may whenever he determines such action appropriate—

How did this ever get into the law? Most members of the Ways and Means Committee know nothing about this. In fact, we asked Secretary Hodges under what authority these textile arrangements were being made. I have tried to trace back the legislative history. Let me say this: This House never debated section 204. It was put in on the Senate side. An amendment came back on this in conference. I have just been looking at the conference report, and it was not even called to the attention of the House in the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I tried to determine what legislative history there might have been on this on the floor of the Senate. Apparently none. This is a very important and serious piece of legislation. It ought to have thorough hearings. The hearings were available 10 minutes before we took the floor of the House today. The report, incidentally, was just available at the time of the request for a rule. As has been pointed out by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Brown], the thing was thought up beginning on March 9, 1962, because it was found out that the President, after conducting these negotiations in Geneva and making this deal—long term, I might remind my colleagues—he found out he did not have the necessary authority. So, having done it, he has come in here to the Congress to get authority which he did not have at the time. This I submit is very bad legislation, and we should not even consider it.

This matter ought to be gone into by this House very thoroughly, or through the committee of the House to which the jurisdiction is assigned. Actually, this jurisdiction is that of the Ways and Means Committee, and I do not think there is anyone here who would deny this is so, if they read section 204.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Agriculture only gains jurisdiction of this amendment to section 204 because this was put in an agricultural bill—I again say on the Senate side—without its having been brought to the attention of the Members on the House side.

Mr. Speaker, if this were not so basically important to our whole foreign economics, I would not be so excited as I am about it. But this—I again emphasize—renders meaningless the work that we are doing in the Ways and Means Committee in trying to spell out escape clause proceedings, peril points, the Defense adjustment section, and so forth. We shall get into these trade adjustment sections of the newly proposed

bill. All right; I have had a great deal of sympathy for the textile people. Indeed, I still have. But this is government by men, gentlemen. Do the Members of the House realize what is going to happen, and what is happening? An industry that is affected, whether it is glass, pottery or whatever it is, cannot come in under the law. It can come in only at the discretion of the President—whoever comes before him. At least in the escape clause proceedings we tried to spell out how anyone could come in and what their rights were. There are no rights allowed except as the "dictator" in this sense, because that is what we make of the President—unless he says "yes, I will help the textile people or whoever."

Mr. Speaker, I asked Secretary Hodges just a few minutes ago in our Ways and Means Committee hearings what sort of procedures there were under section 204. He could not tell me. I said then, "Can you tell me what procedure the textile industry followed in having their case heard, and not having that of lead and zinc or any of these other industries, as well as the labor unions which are affected."

Gentlemen this is one of the worst pieces of legislation, section 204, I have seen in my 12 years in the Congress.

It is about as serious a thing to the future of this country as I can think of; and I am shocked to find that Secretary Hodges says that it has the approval of this administration.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LINDSAY. Did I understand the gentleman correctly that when the Secretary of Commerce was testifying before the Ways and Means Committee in behalf of the administration's reciprocal trade bill he confessed that he did not even know that his own Department had sent this letter that appears in the committee report, endorsing this piece of protectionist legislation before us?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. That is what his testimony was just about an hour ago. And frankly, I was shocked, because he said he did not know and that is why he had not gone into it with the Ways and Means Committee. Then the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] was interrogating him and pointed out the date of the Commerce Department's letter. Granted, the Commerce Department's letter was not signed by Secretary Hodges; it was signed by Edward Gudeman, Acting Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I just want to associate myself with the gentleman from Missouri in the remarks that he has made. He is 100 percent correct in every respect.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER].

(Mr. CRAMER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to speak out of order.)

LATEST CASTRO PROPOSAL TO EXCHANGE 1,179 POLITICAL PRISONERS FOR \$62 MILLION IS EXAMPLE OF CUBAN PRIME MINISTER'S GROWING ARROGANCE—UNITED STATES SHOULD RESIST EFFORTS TO PARTICIPATE IN ANY SUCH PROGRAM OF EXTORTION AND BLACKMAIL

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, last May 17 Fidel Castro made his abortive proposal of tractors for prisoners. In answer to that request by Fidel Castro for tribute, suggesting blackmail, proposing that because of the invasion the United States should indemnify Cuba and the Communists, finally the administration, after going along with the proposal, disowned it. Now we find this year Fidel Castro, through a tribunal proposing, not tractors, but Yankee dollars for prisoners; Yankee dollars that are negotiable and can be spent for more war materiel to help build up the arsenal on this Communist Cuban island 90 miles from the shores of this country.

Why my concern about that? It is only because I am concerned not only with Communist infiltration and growth in this hemisphere, but I am concerned about our American people, I am concerned about the tobacco workers in my district who are being asked to make a substantial sacrifice. One thousand of them are out of work today in order to help to prevent American dollars from going to Communist Cuba, to bolster the Communist regime of Castro, who is in as bad a financial position as he has ever been and who has got to have American dollars to get out of it. But the workers in my district, these tobacco workers, 1,000 of them who are unemployed, and 5,000 of them will be before not too long, are asked to make a sacrifice so that Yankee dollars will not go to Fidel Castro. They felt that Cuba should be brought under the embargo provisions of the law and the President of the United States even went so far as to use the Trading With the Enemy Act, on my request, to see to it that third nations would not be able to import cigars into this country, cigars made from Cuban tobacco.

And the other day the President issued an order that money orders could not be mailed to the Cuban people, which had amounted to half a million dollars a year, in order to prevent the drain of dollars. Yet we find the administration now issuing visas to exiles, to refugees, to permit them to go to Fidel Castro's Cuba and to negotiate the matter of the payment of over \$60 million, four times as much as Fidel Castro asked for in tractors, the last time, in order to provide Castro with the dollars that he needs to keep communism going in Cuba.

Mr. Speaker, I am unalterably opposed to it, as equally opposed as I was when I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 322, against tractors for prisoners. I am opposed to dollars for prisoners, particularly when the American people are being asked to make a sacrifice in order to keep dollars from going to Fidel Castro and the Communists.

This is becoming an annual affair. A year ago, Castro asked the equivalent of

\$15 million in exchange for some 1,200 lives. Today, he asks for better than \$60 million to save an equal number. The inescapable conclusion is that Castro, by quadrupling the size of the ransom, merely demonstrates that his arrogance has been multiplied by four.

Castro says he has 1,179 political prisoners involved in this newest proposition. For them he asks prices ranging from \$25,000 for the lower ranked ones to as much as a half million dollars for the so-called leaders, but all adding up to something approximating \$62 million. Reports have it that either Castro gets the ransom, or the prisoners face up to 30 years in prison.

I must, because of this choice, challenge the administration to take the only possible stand—millions for defense but not a dime for tribute.

While we must sympathize with the plight of the prisoners and their families, the elementary fact is that neither the United States nor its citizens can participate in any such continuing process of extortion and blackmail. Once we rescue the 1,179 lives involved in this swap, I fear that Castro will merely clap an equal number into prison and demand another ransom, or at least demand ransom for the estimated 20,000 other prisoners still languishing in Cuban jails.

We should not fall for Castro's obvious blackmail which, if we acknowledge the ridiculous judgment of his kangaroo court, is the resumption of relations with the United States. This time, we have two more sound reasons for refusing to pay tribute—first, the knowledge that he will not kill the prisoners because of the obvious repercussions that would be felt throughout the Western Hemisphere—and second, the fact that he may be down to his last few pesos.

Mr. Speaker, I am quite concerned with the business of individuals dealing with the Cuban Government in such a serious matter, whether under the aegis of the U.S. Government, or as individuals or committees or what. I am not so sure but what we have a very grave situation on our hands, since the administration has apparently given its stamp of approval to negotiation of this latest Castro scheme by issuing visas to the exiles from Cuba who just this week flew to Havana to negotiate for the release of these prisoners. It seems to me that negotiations by anyone in the United States as to this situation bring up a question of possible violation of the Logan Act. It further strikes me that providing funds to the enemy is a violation of the Trading With the Enemy Act.

And since the administration has just invoked the latter in order to finally plug the loophole that allowed Cuban products to come into this country via a third country, and because of the aforementioned action of the Post Office Department in banning the exchange of postal money orders between the United States and Cuba, it would seem that progress was being made in order to rid this hemisphere of Castroism, but suddenly the administration again reverts to the softness-on-communism approach by issuing visas to Cuban exiles dedicated to securing the release of the 1,179 prisoners.

Mr. Speaker, the Castro star dims more each day, and he is running out of money. Thus, the American people should take advantage of his growing weaknesses and refuse to participate in any such scheme of blackmail, in order to provide him with sufficient funds to keep himself in power and to pay off his debts to his Communist allies.

I do not believe the 1,179 prisoners would favor this blackmail either, when the effect is to keep the dollars going to Castro at a time when he is weakening, and thus subvert the very cause of freedom for which they indicated their approval by their willingness to lay down their lives.

REGULATION OF TEXTILE IMPORTS

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remaining time on this side to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY].

(Mr. FINDLEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, to me it seems a shame that so little attention is being given to this bill, with only 1 hour in which to debate the rule and, as I understand it, only 1 hour in which to debate the legislative content of the bill.

I might add, too, that less than 1 hour was devoted to this bill by the Committee on Agriculture. It came to the committee before noon. I had no advance knowledge of it. Maybe my colleagues did. The hearings were very brief. There was very little discussion. The printed hearings, as has been mentioned, were not available until shortly before noon today.

If you will examine the printed hearings on the bill you will see that they include 23 pages, much of it in very small type, and they include the text of the long-term cotton textile arrangement which this bill is supposed to authorize the President to conclude. How the Committee on Agriculture could possibly adequately consider this proposal, not even having at hand the text of the arrangement the bill was devoted to, I cannot imagine.

I invite your attention to page 12 of the hearings, section (c). It closes with a very interesting sentence:

If such trade is frustrating the operation of this arrangement, the participating countries shall consider taking such action as may be consistent with their law to prevent such frustration.

It seems to me that language like that should be thoroughly explored by the committee before any authority is enacted to carry out such an arrangement.

In my questioning of one of the witnesses before the committee I raised the question as to whether the President actually had authority to enter into bilateral agreements such as entered into at Geneva. The witness responded that the President had multilateral authority because the word "government" had an "s" after it; it was plural.

There is still doubt in my mind and in the minds of many people as to whether this section 204 intended to authorize simply bilateral arrangements or

whether it was to be multilateral. A point like that surely should be clarified before the Committee on Agriculture before it is presented to the House.

H.R. 9900 would give the President increased authority to lower trade barriers by reducing tariffs through multinational cartel deals. Our tariffs are already so low in relation to the other free nations that we have very little to bargain with. This bill shows the true intent of the administration in developing trade policy. Quotas are to be the tool for trade control in the future.

This bill would give the President almost unlimited authority. It would deal not just with cotton textiles. It would deal with any agricultural commodities or agricultural products as well as textiles and textile products. That covers a wide area.

This bill deserves more thorough committee action. The rule should be defeated.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT].

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to disillusion anybody, but I am not so sure the gentleman from Georgia had everything to do with this proposal because I read to you now a letter received on July 20, 1961. That was a little ahead of the moment when these negotiations started with the House Members and a special committee which I attended. This particular document says, and I read:

MANCHESTER, ENGLAND.—Textile manufacturers are now complaining that the U.S. raw cotton gifts and textile deals with so-called backward countries is unfair competition and we in America are to blame.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the House is not in order.

The SPEAKER. The House will be in order. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. DENT. It is all right. They do not want to hear it. Even when I was a boy, Mr. GROSS, my father used to say I can talk to you, but if you do not want to listen, I cannot make you hear me. I read further:

Hong Kong manufacturers [probably getting rich at our expense] have joined the Hong Kong labor unionists in a big howl against us because we want to adapt reasonable protection against unlimited imports of textile which has forced huge losses in the United States of jobs and investments.

The reason I read that to you is to call to your attention what is being done by this legislation. The textile Members of Congress who come from textile States think they are getting something that they suggested. Well, do not be fooled, gentlemen, you are getting exactly what the participating countries in the Geneva agreement demanded. They demanded that we curtail the imports from the underdeveloped countries which have been our babies, as it were, in this free world that we are fighting for because they said they would not sign an agreement with us for any length of time unless we cut our imports from the underdeveloped countries where we were developing textile productivity. Now the

countries that signed this agreement had to have a promise that we curtail the imports from these countries and that is all this does besides legalizing an act which I think died in 1958 insofar as the authority for this particular action is concerned.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. I understand this bill does something for the textile industry. What I want to know is—does it do anything for my coal miners and pottery workers and glassworkers?

Mr. DENT. If we pass this legislation, it not only will not do anything for your pottery and glass workers, it will do something to them.

Mr. HAYS. Then I had better vote against it; would you not say?

Mr. DENT. Because this legislation is relief for the textile people. They deserve the very best protection that they can get. If anybody here can salve his conscience saying that this is not protectionist legislation, then he has a mighty thin conscience to salve because you cannot go to a cocktail party in the afternoon as a free trader and get drunk in a common barroom at night as a protectionist. That is what we are doing. We are voting protectionist and flying the flag of free trade. I have never made any bones about it. I am interested in the glass workers and I am interested in the pottery workers and I am interested in the ceramic tile workers just as you are interested in the textile workers and just the same as I am interested in your textile workers. I am going to give you a vote on the premise that you are going to be just as interested in the workers in my district as I am in yours.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. You can give them your vote, but do not vote under the impression that they are going to reciprocate.

Mr. DENT. It has been the history of the reciprocal trade agreements that they have not, but I have made no agreement. I am depending on their conscience.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. I want to apologize to the gentleman from Pennsylvania for not giving him credit for the effort he has made to protect American industry and labor from unfair foreign competition. But, does not the gentleman believe that the present administration is now following the same program and the same trade policy in this particular instance as was followed under the protectionist theories which obtained during the administration of President McKinley?

Mr. DENT. Well, under President McKinley they campaigned under the program of three P's—peace, prosperity, and progress. But since that time there have been three P's invoked—pressure, promise, and purchase.

Mr. BROWN. May I congratulate the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE].

(Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 10788, the regulation of textile imports bill, is designed to close up a dangerous loophole in section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956.

That act authorized the President to negotiate international agreements relating to the export to, and the import by the United States of any agricultural commodity or product manufactured therefrom or textile or textile products. Because it was drafted primarily with bilateral agreements in mind, the existence of necessary power in the President with respect to nonparticipants in a broadly based multilateral agreement is questionable. In both the 1-year cotton textiles arrangement presently in force and the long-term cotton textiles arrangement, expected to come into force with substantially the same participants on October 1, 1962, provisions permit the United States to take action to prevent trade with nonparticipants in the arrangements from frustrating the purposes of the arrangements. Since countries accounting for 90 percent of the free world trade in cotton textiles are participants, the same authority which the President has already been delegated by section 204 should clearly be extended to nonparticipants to prevent the minority of countries which choose to stay out of the arrangements from thereby gaining an advantage over the countries which participate in them.

The enactment of this bill would involve no additional expenditure by the United States.

The Secretary of Commerce requested the introduction of H.R. 10788, by means of an executive communication to the Speaker of the House. Its enactment has been recommended by the Departments of State, Agriculture, and Labor.

It should be noted that the Interagency Textile Administrative Committee on which the Department of Labor is represented, has studied this bill and has recommended its enactment.

Representatives of producer and textile groups appeared at the hearing on the bill and testified in its support. It is particularly significant that there were no opposition witnesses.

This bill will permit the President to issue regulations which will make the provisions of the agreement relating to cotton textiles effective also against the small minority of cotton textile exporting countries which are not parties to the agreement. In the absence of such authority it might be possible for such countries, although their exports now constitute only a small portion of the total, to increase their exports to such an extent as to nullify the voluntary action of the cooperating countries. //

It is a form of insurance against the undercutting of markets that would have an adverse effect upon world trade.

Because textile groups support H.R. 10788, and because there is no expressed opposition to the bill, nothing stands in the way of its prompt enactment.

This is legislation that will benefit our cotton textile industry.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER].

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule which makes in order consideration of legislation which is long overdue. I will not undertake to recount again for my colleagues the plight of the textile industry; we have done that on so many occasions.

Recently at Geneva a multilateral agreement resulted. Without this legislation the action taken at Geneva will be a nullity, because with all the good intentions and efforts of the signatories to the Geneva agreement we will still have this continuing threat of the elimination of textile jobs in America if other nations not parties to that agreement can unload excessive amounts of textiles upon the American market.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WHITENER. I yield for a brief question.

Mr. DENT. Does not this legislation mean that we are nullifying the favored-nation clause insofar as the textile industry is concerned?

Mr. WHITENER. I may say to the gentleman that I come from a district which perhaps has more textile employees and more spindles in place than any other congressional district in America. By reason of that I have been particularly concerned with the textile situation. I say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that many of us are appreciative of his efforts of a broader nature in this problem of imports I know something of the travail of the gentleman from Pennsylvania in the light of some recent occurrences, and certainly have great interest in the position which he has taken. I can also say this to the gentleman. All of us from the textile area have a great appreciation for the painstaking effort of the gentleman from Pennsylvania to fully develop for the record the facts on this problem of textile imports as well as of other imports. I think I might say with some accuracy that the work of the gentleman from Pennsylvania and his special subcommittee has resulted in a more intelligent attitude being taken toward the textile industry, and I quite agree with our friend from Pennsylvania that as we face these issues in the coming days we should not be too quick to forget our friends who have stood by us as we fought together to protect the jobs of American people.

I think it must be said and must be admitted that this legislation which we have before us is designed to do that very thing. It is in a restricted field, I admit. But, my friends, the textile problem was the only area in which the Committee on Agriculture could have acted, because they were amending a section of the Agricultural Adjustment Act which relates strictly to textiles. I regret that it does not include some of these other beleaguered industries for which I have the greatest sympathy.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution. The previous question was ordered.

The question was taken and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 264, nays 76, not voting 96, as follows:

[Roll No. 65]

YEAS—264

| | | |
|----------------|-----------------|----------------|
| Abbutt | Flood | Mailliard |
| Abernethy | Fogarty | Marshall |
| Addabbo | Forrester | Martin, Mass. |
| Addonizio | Fountain | Mathias |
| Albert | Friedel | Matthews |
| Alexander | Gallagher | Marrow |
| Alford | Garland | Miller, Clem |
| Arends | Garmatz | Milliken |
| Ashley | Gary | Mills |
| Ashmore | Gathings | Moeller |
| Aspinall | Glaimo | Monagan |
| Avery | Gilbert | Montoya |
| Baker | Gonzalez | Moore |
| Baldwin | Granahan | Moorhead, Pa. |
| Baring | Gray | Morgan |
| Bass, N.H. | Green, Oreg. | Morris |
| Bass, Tenn. | Green, Pa. | Morse |
| Bates | Griffiths | Moss |
| Beckworth | Gubser | Multer |
| Belcher | Hagen, Calif. | Murray |
| Bennett, Fla. | Hagan, Ga. | Natcher |
| Blatnik | Haley | Norrell |
| Boggs | Halleck | O'Brien, N.Y. |
| Boland | Halpern | O'Hara, Mich. |
| Bolling | Hardy | O'Neill |
| Bonner | Harris | Osmers |
| Bow | Harvey, Ind. | Ostertag |
| Brademas | Hays | Passman |
| Brooks | Hébert | Perkins |
| Brown | Hechler | Peterson |
| Broyhill | Hemphill | Pike |
| Burke, Ky. | Henderson | Pilcher |
| Burke, Mass. | Hoeven | Pirnie |
| Burleson | Holifield | Poage |
| Byrne, Pa. | Holland | Poff |
| Cannon | Horan | Powell |
| Carey | Hosmer | Price |
| Celler | Hull | Purcell |
| Chamberlain | Ichord, Mo. | Quie |
| Chenoweth | Inouye | Randall |
| Chiperfield | Jensen | Reece |
| Clark | Joelson | Reifell |
| Cohelan | Johnson, Calif. | Reuss |
| Colmer | Johnson, Md. | Rhodes, Pa. |
| Conte | Johnson, Wis. | Riehlman |
| Cook | Jonas | Rivers, Alaska |
| Cooley | Jones, Mo. | Rivers, S.C. |
| Corbett | Judd | Roberts, Tex. |
| Corman | Karsten | Rodino |
| Cramer | Karth | Rogers, Colo. |
| Cunningham | Kastenmeier | Rogers, Fla. |
| Curtin | Kearns | Rogers, Tex. |
| Daddario | Keith | Rooney |
| Daniels | Keogh | Rosenthal |
| Davis | Kilgore | Roush |
| James C. Davis | King, Calif. | Rutherford |
| John W. Davis | King, N.Y. | Ryan, Mich. |
| Davis, Tenn. | King, Utah | Ryan, N.Y. |
| Delaney | Kirwan | Santangelo |
| Dent | Kornegay | Saund |
| Denton | Kowalski | Saylor |
| Dominick | Kunkel | Schneebeli |
| Dorn | Landrum | Schweiker |
| Downing | Lane | Scranton |
| Doyle | Lennon | Seely-Brown |
| Dulski | Lesinski | Sheppard |
| Durno | Loser | Shipley |
| Edmondson | McDowell | Short |
| Elliot | McFall | Sibal |
| Everett | McIntire | Sikes |
| Evins | McMillan | Siler |
| Fallon | McSweeney | Sisk |
| Farbstein | Macdonald | Slack |
| Feighan | Mack | Smith, Iowa |
| Fenton | Magnuson | Smith, Va. |
| Fisher | Mahon | |

| | | |
|----------------|------------------|------------|
| Stafford | Tuck | Whalley |
| Steed | Tupper | Wharton |
| Stephens | Udall, Morris K. | Whitener |
| Stratton | Ullman | Wickersham |
| Stubblefield | Vanik | Williams |
| Sullivan | Van Zandt | Willis |
| Taylor | Vinson | Winstead |
| Teague, Tex. | Waggonner | Wright |
| Thomas | Wallhauser | Young |
| Thompson, Tex. | Watts | Younger |
| Thornberry | Weaver | Zablocki |
| Toll | Weis | Zelenko |
| Trimble | Westland | |

NAYS—76

| | | |
|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Adair | Findley | Mason |
| Alger | Fino | Miller, N.Y. |
| Andersen, | Ford | Minshall |
| Minn. | Frelinghuysen | Moorehead, |
| Ashbrook | Glenn | Ohio |
| Barry | Goodell | Mosher |
| Becker | Goodling | Nelsen |
| Beermann | Griffin | Norblad |
| Bell | Gross | Nygaard |
| Bennett, Mich. | Hall | O'Konski |
| Berry | Harrison, Wyo. | Pelly |
| Betts | Hiestand | Pillion |
| Bolton | Johansen | Ray |
| Bray | Kilburn | Robison |
| Bromwell | Knox | Roudebush |
| Broomfield | Kyl | Rousselot |
| Bruce | Laird | St. George |
| Byrnes, Wis. | Langen | Schadeberg |
| Cederberg | Latta | Schenck |
| Clancy | Lindsay | Scherer |
| Curtis, Mo. | Lipscomb | Shriver |
| Dague | McCulloch | Taber |
| Derounian | McDonough | Thomson, Wis. |
| Devine | McVey | Tollefson |
| Dole | MacGregor | Utt |
| Ellsworth | Martin, Nebr. | Wilson, Calif. |

NOT VOTING—96

| | | |
|----------------|--------------------|----------------|
| Anderson, Ill. | Fulton | Nix |
| Andrews | Gavin | O'Brien, Ill. |
| Anfuso | Grant | O'Hara, Ill. |
| Auchincloss | Hansen | Patman |
| Ayres | Harding | Pfost |
| Bailey | Harrison, Va. | Philbin |
| Barrett | Harsha | Pucinski |
| Battin | Harvey, Mich. | Rains |
| Blitch | Healey | Rhodes, Ariz. |
| Boykin | Herlong | Roberts, Ala. |
| Breeding | Hoffman, Ill. | Roosevelt |
| Brewster | Hoffman, Mich. | Rostenkowski |
| Buckley | Huddleston | St. Germain |
| Cahill | Jarman | Schwengel |
| Casey | Jennings | Scott |
| Chelf | Jones, Ala. | Selden |
| Church | Kee | Shelley |
| Coad | Kelly | Smith, Calif. |
| Collier | Kitchin | Smith, Miss. |
| Curtis, Mass. | Kluczynski | Spence |
| Poff | Lankford | Springer |
| Dawson | Libonati | Staggers |
| Derwinski | Madden | Teague, Calif. |
| Diggs | May | Thompson, La. |
| Dingell | Meador | Thompson, N.J. |
| Donohue | Michel | Van Pelt |
| Dooley | Miller | Walter |
| Dowdy | George P. Morrison | Whitten |
| Dwyer | Moulder | Widnall |
| Fascell | Murphy | Wilson, Ind. |
| Finnegan | Nedzi | Yates |
| Flynt | | |
| Frazier | | |

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Walter with Mr. Harsha.
 Mr. Libonati with Mrs. May.
 Mr. Morrison with Mr. Rhodes of Arizona.
 Mr. Donohue with Mr. Ayres.
 Mr. Philbin with Mr. Widnall.
 Mr. Jennings with Mr. Battin.
 Mr. Harrison of Virginia with Mr. Harvey of Michigan.
 Mr. Frazier with Mr. Michel.
 Mr. Brewster with Mr. Curtis of Massachusetts.
 Mr. Huddleston with Mr. Cahill.
 Mr. Dowdy with Mr. Gavin.
 Mr. Finnegan with Mr. Van Pelt.
 Mr. O'Brien of Illinois with Mr. Smith of California.
 Mr. Murphy with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois.
 Mr. George P. Miller with Mr. Dooley.
 Mr. O'Hara of Illinois with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.

Mr. Yates with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan.
 Mr. Bailey with Mr. Collier.
 Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Teague of California.

Mrs. Pfost with Mr. Wilson of Indiana.
 Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Springer.
 Mr. Rostenkowski with Mrs. Dwyer.
 Mr. St. Germain with Mr. Fulton.
 Mr. Dingell with Mr. Auchincloss.
 Mr. Scott with Mr. Meader.
 Mr. Kitchin with Mr. Schwengel.
 Mr. Chelf with Mr. Derwinski.
 Mr. Shelley with Mrs. Church.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10788) to amend section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956.

The motion was agreed to.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, a lot has been said about this section of the law which we are trying to amend, section 204. The gentlemen who have discussed it obviously are not familiar with the history of section 204. It was not put in the Senate. It was put in in conference when the House and Senate members were conferring on H.R. 12, which was later vetoed by President Eisenhower. I had an amendment prepared which I submitted in conference myself.

I was prompted to offer the amendment because a gentleman from Japan was here in the city of Washington and he had knocked on just about every door in this great city trying to arrange to confer with someone about textile imports coming into this country. He went from department to department and finally came to my office. I do not know who directed him to my office. But when he discussed this problem with me I assured him of my cooperation, because he stated to me frankly that he was aware of the fact that they could not burden our economy in America by unlimited large quantities of textile imports into our market. So after discussion with him and appreciating the difficulties which he had encountered, I brought this amendment to the attention of the conferees and it was adopted, in 1956.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I thank the gentleman for throwing light on it. I think the gentleman would agree that there is nothing on the subject in the House first. Am I correct on that?

Mr. COOLEY. The section was put into the bill in conference.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I think there was something in the Senate version. Let me refer to the Senate reports of the 84th Congress, 2d session, 1956. On page 7 it sets out the committee report, Senator ELLENDER's report on the Agricultural Act of 1956.

Section 204 of that bill, and I can read it because it is only three lines, says:

Agreements limiting imports—Section 204: The President is authorized to negotiate agreements with foreign governments in an effort to limit the export to the United States of agricultural commodities or products including textiles or textile products.

So I imagine your amendment then was in effect in lieu of this section that was in the Senate bill.

Mr. COOLEY. I think the gentleman is correct.

Mr. Chairman, this bill has been fairly well discussed and I shall not attempt to discuss the details of it further. I do want to say, however, that it is unusual in that the bill is supported by the Department of Commerce, by the Secretary of State, by the Secretary of Labor and by the Secretary of Agriculture. So four departments of Government have gone on record as supporting this measure. It also has the support of the Director of Foreign Trade and of the National Cotton Council of America, Mr. Read Dunn; Mr. Robert C. Jackson, executive vice president, American Cotton Manufacturers Institute; Mr. Stanley Nehmer, Deputy Director, Office of International Resources of the Department of State; Hon. Hickman Price Jr., Assistant Secretary of Commerce; Robert C. Sherman, Director, Cotton Division, Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Agriculture; William F. Sullivan, president, Northern Textile Association.

I have a telegram from Robert T. Stevens of the J. T. Stevens Co. also in support of the measure.

I do not recall that there was any opposition to this bill when it was considered in the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Did the committee give public notice that there were going to be hearings on the bill because many people who have testified before the Committee on Ways and Means in the past 2 or 3 weeks expressed deep concern against this, including representatives of textile workers.

Mr. COOLEY. I do not know how much notice was given but, certainly, there was no effort to close the doors of our committee room against anyone who wanted to appear either in support of the bill or in opposition to it. This is supported by the gentleman from Georgia, Hon. CARL VINSON, who heads up the cotton textile committee group here in the House of Representatives.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I was not suggesting that the committee was trying to hide it, but I was simply trying to point out that on a thing as important as this is, and this is an important measure, it is important to give public notice out so that people who are concerned may know about it.

Mr. COOLEY. I agree with the gentleman. It is very important. I think this is a very important measure because the President must have this authority if he is to be able to protect the integrity of the Geneva agreement which

has been signed by 19 nations. I hope the House passes the bill.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. In other words, he does have the authority?

Mr. COOLEY. Certainly. If you read section 204, it says he has the right to enter into agreements with governments—not one government, but with governments. So this is a multilateral agreement. I do not think there is any question about it at all.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. If he does not need the authority, then you do not need the bill.

Mr. COOLEY. This is for the purpose of trying to control nations that are not signatories to this agreement.

(Mr. HOEVEN (at the request of Mr. McINTIRE) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point.)

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, this bill was reported out of the Committee on Agriculture without a record vote with most members supporting the legislation.

The purpose of this bill is to augment the recent international cotton textile agreement made at Geneva, Switzerland, by our Nation and 18 other cotton-textile importing and exporting countries.

The bill gives the President the authority to restrict imports into the United States from nations which are not parties to the Geneva pact. The administration contended that in the absence of this legislation nations which are not signatories to the Geneva pact would be in a position to nullify the voluntary action of the nations that did participate in the international agreement.

Apparently there is some inconsistency between this legislation and the President's recommendations for freer trade under proposed amendments to the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951. It is argued that this legislation in the context of the Reciprocal Trade bill's various escape clauses and exceptions, should not create another significant exception to the basic policy of the United States trading with all friendly nations freely and equitably.

As the committee report indicates, the Geneva agreement would encompass some 90 percent of the world trade in textiles. In the hearing on this bill the committee did not explore the effect on the 10 percent of the nations who are not involved in the Geneva pact.

Under the circumstances, I suggest that the committee give its most serious consideration to the legislation now before us.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 7 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation would serve to correct an irregularity implicit to section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956, an authority which permits the President to enter into short- and long-term agreements on imports of textiles or textile products into the United States.

These agreements are bilateral and, in effect, multilateral in nature, with 18 such agreements having been arrived at with the United States and other countries. It was under this authority that President Eisenhower negotiated the first 5-year quota agreement with Japan in 1956.

There are, however, about 10 or 15 percent of the textile-trading countries that have not moved forward to become signatories to those agreements negotiated between the United States and other countries. And, ironically, these minority nations—who are important textile-trading countries—would derive benefits over and above those enjoyed by the majority countries signing agreements with the United States. Unlike the signatory countries they would, for instance, be free to operate clear of limitations on their textile exports into the signatory countries, including the United States.

This legislation would, then, correct an inequity which presently attends the program for long-term and short-term agreements on imports of textiles into the United States. It would do this by providing that if a multilateral agreement has been or shall be concluded under the section 204 authority, the President would be permitted to make applicable to nonsigning countries limitations on textile imports into the United States comparable to those in effect for those countries that sign agreements with this country for a textile trade program.

Mr. Chairman, last summer and again this winter agreements have been reached pertaining to imports of cotton textiles into the United States, these agreements being scheduled to be in effect until 1967. In addition, the United States will, in the future, enter into agreements with other countries with relation to imports of wool and man-made fiber textiles.

Because H.R. 10788 will act to strengthen the textile trade provisions of section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956, I strongly urge its approval by the House of Representatives.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McINTIRE. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Section 204, does it not, also covers more than agricultural products; it covers the wide range of manufactured products.

Mr. McINTIRE. I think it does, and in that context they would be related to agriculture.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. The point I want to make is the same question I asked Secretary of Commerce Hodges just 2 hours ago, and it is this: If this is good procedure for taking care of agricultural products and something that is manufactured from them such as textiles, to what extent can other industries, and I will list some of them, be given protection? Would the gentleman care to comment on that? Does the gentleman think this will be expanded to include everything?

Mr. McINTIRE. The gentleman from Maine will be happy to comment, for he has never supported the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. I have listened with a great deal of interest to what the gentleman has mentioned.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I want to commend the gentleman for maintaining a consistent position; but I should like to point out that the President's proposal on reciprocal trade, H.R. 9900, starts out

with a preamble that is directly in opposition to the philosophy the gentleman has expressed; yet Mr. Hodges says that this action on the part of the Kennedy administration is entirely consistent with these objectives. I think the gentleman is being consistent. I think we will find gross inconsistency, however, on the part of the administration.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McINTIRE. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Is it not true that we are nailing down here today by the passage of this bill, and establishing on solid ground a quota system for the textile industry?

Mr. McINTIRE. I think that is a fair, concise statement, and the limitations under these agreements are very definitely quota limitations, not only by volume but by category of goods.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. In the past, year after year, we have been told a quota system could not work, but now we are agreeing for the textile industry it can work and should work. Is that correct?

Mr. McINTIRE. Certainly the context of the agreement would support the gentleman's observation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maine has expired.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY].

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I would first of all like to direct a question to the gentleman from Maine.

Is it the gentleman's understanding that the other nations which are parties to the Geneva Agreement have already agreed to the terms of that agreement? Are they already bound by it or is this something that is still very indefinite and very much up in the air?

Mr. McINTIRE. I would say to the gentleman while I cannot be definite in my observation, it is my understanding that at the Geneva negotiations a basis of agreement was reached. In fact, one might say a format of the details of the agreement was reached. As to the time when the signatures should be on the document, it is my understanding they have until October in which to become signatories of the agreement. It was negotiated as a memorandum, but it was to be embodied in the agreement as each individual nation signed. It is generally understood that most of them will sign, but there is no firm commitment they will each sign by the time this agreement is to go into effect. But presumably the authority is there.

Mr. FINDLEY. I thank the gentleman. So much emphasis is being placed on tariff cuts that very little attention has been given to the nontariff means of restricting trade. The nontariff tools are actually more widely used than tariffs. Tariffs have declined in importance radically in recent years. Indeed in the case of the United States tariffs have declined to the point where most tariffs are no longer substantial enough to give us bargaining tools to work with in negotiation in the Common Market or elsewhere. If we are really interested in

increasing our exports and in promoting friendly trade relations, we should examine our own protection policies, most of which are nontariff in character.

This bill before us is a prize example. It would permit the President to work out international trade cartels for any agricultural commodity or product. It would authorize the President to slam the door on all imports from nations which are not parties to the deal. The President would have final authority. His authority and the agreements that he could conclude would not be subject to review by either House of Congress.

I might raise the happy prospect that one of these days we may have a different occupant in the White House. Perhaps his attitude on tobacco would not favor the present tobacco program. This bill would give any future President—because there is no time limit—the authority on his own initiative to work out deals to rig the world market in tobacco, in wheat, in livestock, in any agricultural commodity.

This bill is actually intended to offset the disadvantage to American textile mills caused by the 8½ cent per pound subsidy on our own raw cotton exports. That is the root of the trouble. American mills must pay 33 cents a pound for cotton while foreign mills buy the same American cotton for 24½ cents. Thus, the action of the Government to support cotton prices at an artificial level is the root of the problem.

We have been trying to live in a never-never land where we can continue to enjoy the beauties of the competitive world market place without accepting its inherent rigors and responsibilities. In the eyes of our friends abroad, subsidies on exports of American cotton amount to dumping. This is harmful to underdeveloped countries whose main opportunity to earn foreign exchange lies in selling agricultural commodities.

I raise a question for you to think about. What is the effect of this bill on our trade relations with the Philippines, with South American countries, with the emerging countries of Africa?

Our present cotton program—of which this deal is a part—is harmful to American processors because they are denied access of lower world prices for raw materials.

It heaps a double burden on the consumers. They must pay artificially high prices for consumer items and at the same time cough up the taxes for the subsidies which lead to those high prices.

It is harmful in the long run to the American farmer because it tends to restrict world markets. It tends to make him less competitive, less efficient, and worst of all, it places his destiny in the hands of bureaucrats who would have the authority to rig and rerig world markets ad infinitum.

We should stop trying to treat effects and get at the real cause of our trouble. In the interest of all concerned, the cotton subsidy should be brought to a realistic level, and Secretary Freeman has the authority to do this under existing legislation.

Rather than broaden the authority of the President to rig world markets for

a countless number of commodities and items, we should strike section 204 from our law.

Some mention was made of the fact that the American Cotton Textile Manufacturing Institute supports this bill. I call your attention to Newsweek magazine, April 9, this week's issue, page 25, reviewing the happy events for President Kennedy in the prior week.

This was represented as one of those happy events; and I quote:

Endorsement of his tariff program by leaders of the Nation's textile industry—the normally protectionist American Cotton Manufacturer's Institute, meeting at Palm Beach.

Reference was made to the fact that Secretary Freeman endorsed this bill. This is the same Secretary of Agriculture who pointed to our "successful cotton program" as the pattern which we should adopt in developing programs for other agricultural commodities.

Mr. Speaker, do we have ahead in other commodities the same series of events which has brought us to this very difficult problem in cotton? The cotton program is hardly a successful pattern to follow.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEERMANN].

(Mr. BEERMANN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BEERMANN. Mr. Chairman, this bill would amend section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 to facilitate the implementation of multilateral agreements covering the trade in cotton textiles. But does this amendment not also carry an air of cross-purpose legislation? Under the bill the President would be given the power to fix regulations to cover the removal or entry of cotton textiles from countries not a party to these agreements. He already has such authority under present law in regard to countries which are parties to these agreements.

This additional Executive power can be considered to be another lever to be used against the American producer despite the agreements that are made to help the American producer. This two-edged sword would appear to be in complete opposition to previous legislation passed to enable the President to make favorable agreements that would aid rather than hurt the American textile industry. This power coming at this time when H.R. 9900, the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, is receiving great attention, can be considered to be an administration attempt to hold a powerful weapon to insure favorable backing from the textile industry for the administration's new concepts in trade agreements.

My main argument is that appointed people in the executive branch of Government are going to be making these decisions instead of the elected representatives of the people.

For proof and a knowledge of the problems involved ask the producers of livestock and meat products what relief they received when they tried to prove undue hardship due to imports of these

products during a period of low domestic prices.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD following my remarks of a few moments ago.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

(Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin (at the request of Mr. McINTIRE) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

[Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I have pointed out a few things already in the debate on the rule, but I am glad that in my interrogation of the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], some legislative history was finally brought out. Up until then there was none.

Mr. Chairman, I might say that the House, of course, never did consider the merits one way or the other of section 204 when it was put in the law back in 1956.

Mr. Chairman, as a reference and so that we may refer to it in the future, in House Report No. 2077 of the 2d session of the 84th Congress on the farm bill at that time, there was no section 204. This is simply for reference.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. After the President vetoed H.R. 12, the Committee on Agriculture brought in another bill which did not contain the portions objectionable to the President. I do not know what the number was, but maybe the gentleman from Missouri has it.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. It is H.R. 10875, Mr. Chairman.

Then, here is the other thing I wanted for the RECORD: In the Agriculture Act of 1956, the May 22, 1956, conference report, there is a statement by the managers on the part of the House and nothing is said in here about this section. Furthermore, in looking at the Senate debate, which will be found at page 8495, May 18, 1956, when the Senate was considering section 204 there actually was an amendment offered in regard to rice, which was rejected, but there was no discussion at all on this section. In other words, there was no legislative history to go back and try to find out whether the authority intended was bi-lateral or multi-lateral, which is the reason this particular amendment is before you.

In the letter of the Secretary of Commerce he said he did not know; that it was questionable whether there was this authority.

Mr. Chairman, here is a major piece of legislation in respect to our Reciprocal Trade Act and our Trading Act which this House has never debated. Now it comes before us with an opportunity to consider it and we will not even dig into it at this time. I intend, by the way, to offer an amendment to this bill which will eliminate section 204. Here is the gist of the problem: This is a relief section. I am pleased, frankly, that the textile people are able to get relief.

But the point is, how do you get relief under this section? There is nothing spelled out in the way of machinery as to how some other industry can get relief. And this is what I asked Secretary Hodges just a couple of hours ago. I said, "Mr. Secretary, what mechanics does this industry or does a labor group use in order to get relief?"

"Well," he said, "there are not any." And, of course, there are not any. It simply says that whenever the President determines he may take this action.

The Committee on Ways and Means spent considerable time trying to set up the procedures for the peril point, for the escape clause, or the defense aspects of this problem. I have criticized the previous administration as I criticize this one, but granted that machinery to provide relief has not been used, or it has been abused, if anything; here we are coming along looking at a piece of legislation where relief of the most extreme sort is granted, but it goes only to the textile people. How does anyone else claim relief?

Mr. Chairman, do you not see that this is government by men and not government by law? And once you go to government by men this Congress might just as well fold up and go home; you have got a dictatorship. And the fact that these powers are used in this fashion—life or death over this industry or that one; this one shall survive and that one shall die, when no administrative machinery or judicial machinery has been spelled out, means just what I have indicated.

Mr. Chairman, I have been able finally to get, to some degree, into this agreement at Geneva, and let me tell you what it means. It means that we go back to the 1960 census figures in order to determine how much of textiles and from what country can come into what ports; how much into Boston, how much into New York, how much into Los Angeles, how much into Charleston, S.C. When you get into this kind of thing you have an international cartel that is controlled by political bureaucrats who are not responsible to the people in any sense. Talk about freeing trade; nothing could be more damaging to the trade by stifling it, and by going back and freezing the economy in 1960.

I happen to feel that there is an area where we need to spell out machinery in our trade laws. We must talk about fair trade. Our textile people have not had fair competition. I have been in their corner on this. But the textile people have sold out principle, because they can get this immediate protection.

This business of government by men is disturbing to me. Last year, one day

at 8 o'clock at night, I took the floor of the House on the question of the Du Pont tax relief bill, to point out that there was another example where we had a complicated problem of the involuntary divestiture of holdings due to the antitrust laws. We could have corrected it by general legislation that would have enabled any company that was in a similar situation to follow certain procedures. But this administration had sent orders down that it was only for Du Pont, and if anyone else in addition to Du Pont were included, they would veto it. That is government by men, Mr. Chairman. We sought to do last year what we have known for years we had to do. We have to amend the laws in regard to depreciation of property. And yet the textile people were singled out and given liberalized depreciation. I am glad they were, they were entitled to it. But it was not done by law; it was not by law that they were given it, because there are hundreds of other industries that are entitled to the same relief who did not get it. They were singled out; they were brought in and given this liberalized depreciation.

There is only one course of action available to us, to get back to government by law and not by men, and that is to repeal section 204 and hope that in the Committee on Ways and Means we can spell out some meaningful procedures whereby any industry, however little, any union, however little, can come in and present its case and know that they have rights, rights by law, and not something that a wise bureaucracy can give them or not give them, dependent on whims at the time. Look at the political implications involved in this thing, that "If you will do this for us, then we will go ahead and grant you this protection, but woe betide you who oppose this administration or any administration. We will not give it to you."

Mr. Chairman, this is the most serious matter, as I say, that I have seen in the 12 years that I have been in the Congress.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS].

(Mr. GATHINGS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, the United States has traditionally exported more cotton textiles than it imported throughout the years. That pattern was reversed in 1960. In 1960 \$621,400,000 of cotton textiles and various other textiles were imported into this country. Our exports in textiles for 1960 were only \$509,300,000, or a \$112 million loss in balance of payments on this item alone.

There is reason behind these imports exceeding the exports. In the first place, foreign labor costs are much less than we pay our labor in this country. Another reason is that some of these countries have quite a bit of volume output. They have a high productivity. Especially in Japan does that situation exist.

Who is at stake here with respect to this legislation? In the first place, the cottongrower is vitally concerned with what we do here today. For many, many years the export of raw cotton exceeded the actual consumption by the mills in this country. That trend was changed in the early 1930's, however. The cotton merchant is interested in this matter because he wants to sell cotton to the mills. The manufacturer of cotton textiles is vitally concerned with this legislation because he is at a serious disadvantage in view of these higher costs he runs into in trying to compete with the low-cost labor in other countries. But most important, the laboring man himself is most vitally concerned with this legislation because of the fact that he wants to continue to be employed in the mills. In 1947 there were 1,100,000 textile workers in this country. By 1958 that 1,100,000 had dwindled to 800,000 workers, or a reduction of 28 percent.

Let us look for a moment at this legislation. It was sent down by the Department of Commerce by executive communication to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, who transmitted it to Chairman COOLEY, who introduced the bill.

This legislation is needed badly, because at the Geneva meeting there were 18 signatories to this arrangement affecting the imports of cotton textiles. There are a few countries that were not brought into that arrangement, amounting to some 10 percent of the volume of these textiles that are entering this country. That 10 percent could disrupt, that 10 percent could have a most adverse effect on the 90 percent that we attempted to correct by the arrangement that was entered into at Geneva. It would frustrate the agreement, if something is not done to amend the act to give the President this authority to write regulations affecting those countries who were not participants to the arrangement. Now I do not see anything that should make for undue excitement over this bill.

Section 204 was written into the Agricultural Act of 1956. It was signed into law by President Eisenhower along with its other provisions. Doubtless the Congress knew it was in there or it would never have approved it in the conference report on that bill in 1956. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] made an appeal to the House by innuendo. He made no charge—he did not, but he just said that probably there was a timing involved here with respect to the date of early March when the executive communication was sent to the Speaker early in March and followed by the introduction of this bill, which was about the time a vote was taken on the tax bill. But these negotiations had taken place for many weeks in advance of that time in Geneva. These signatories, of course, were not concerned over a vote on the tax bill or with respect to any other vote in this House. They voluntarily entered into this agreement and signed it. What we are trying to do is to bring all of the countries that import textiles into our country under this arrangement so that they, too,

would be affected and would not disrupt the arrangement of the 90 percent of the total volume of these imports.

I do trust, Mr. Chairman, that the legislation will be approved.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT].

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, regardless of how we feel about the merits or demerits of passing legislation by this method, there is one thing we must remember and that is unless we do something in this particular area, the time will come when, and it will not be too long, we will not have any textile industry left. It might interest you to know that we have lost in exactly 14 years, 330,000 employees in the textile industry and we have closed 844 mills in that time. If you go into the picture of textiles, you will find that the wage levels are probably the deterring factor in our attempts to export as of the last 10 years. For instance, in the last 10 years we have drifted in certain specific exports of domestic products to where we now export less than 7 percent of our volume and we import a percentage of our total production as high as 51.2 percent. The wages paid run anywhere from 36½ cents for the highest paid inspector as against an American inspector getting \$2.25, down to 25 cents an hour for those who work in the production end dealing with specific jobs on the floor. That is 25 cents, I remind you, as against our lowest wage of \$1.50.

In the entire industry from New England all the way down to the Deep South the impact of imports and exports on employment in the textile industry make up the double blow this indispensable industry has received from imports. This is borne out by the record. Only because of the fact that a militant group has insisted this industry got some relief under the Office of Defense. Based upon the records of the hearings held before the subcommittee I headed last year, I am of the opinion that today we would be insufficiently supplied with our own production of textiles to wage any kind of war this country might engage in. We cannot pursue the policy we have in the past without destroying this industry. Remember that when you sell \$1 million of cotton but import \$750,000 of cotton content in textiles you are the loser and not the gainer, although in dollar volume you might seem to be the winner.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I have refreshed my recollection with reference to the legislative history of section 204 which is now under discussion. When the bill H.R. 12 was in conference in 1956, I prepared and presented to the conferees section 204. After a discussion in conference, the amendment I offered was accepted. After the bill containing section 204 was approved by both Houses, H.R. 12 was vetoed by President Eisenhower.

Thereafter I introduced H.R. 10875, and on page 32 of that bill which was introduced April 30, 1956, you will find the same explanation, and in our committee report on H.R. 10875, which was filed April 30, 1956, you will find on page

8 the same provision and a discussion of it.

I do not understand how the gentleman can say that this provision has not been frankly and fairly put before and discussed in the House. The gentleman was here in 1956. I am certain I do not recall that this section was controversial, and I am surprised that the gentleman's being so disturbed over it now.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I am very happy to get this additional legislative history. I have read the other reports but I did not find the section in the bill which the House considered. The gentleman has the report in front of him. May I ask what the section number was? I leafed through this somewhat hurriedly and may have missed it.

Mr. COOLEY. In H.R. 10875 it appears under the title "Agreements Limiting Imports," section 203.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. It was section 203 at that time.

Mr. COOLEY. Yes.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I will check through it again. I will say this to the gentleman, that I think the members of the Ways and Committee will admit that I was a member. Certainly I had not heard of anything like this being in the bill or I would have been disturbed over it at that time. I was not aware of this until about 3 or 4 weeks ago when we began our hearings on the Reciprocal Trade Act.

Mr. COOLEY. If the gentleman will look at page 43 of the report on H.R. 12 he will see it was discussed in the report.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I have been interested in legislation which actually became law. I am not referring back to H.R. 12.

Mr. COOLEY. In that report on H.R. 12 we discussed it, and it was discussed in the report on the other bill that I introduced, H.R. 10875.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. If that is so, then I am in error.

Mr. COOLEY. The legislative history clearly indicates that the President was authorized to negotiate multilateral agreements.

We say in the report "foreign countries." In the law we say "foreign governments."

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. If the gentleman is correct, then we do not need this bill.

Mr. COOLEY. Yes, we do. I do not think the gentleman understands the bill.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Yes, I do.

Mr. COOLEY. It has been stated that the purpose of the bill is to give power to the President he does not now have to control imports from countries other than the signatories to that agreement. I made it perfectly plain.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I will read from a letter in the committee report written by the Acting Secretary of Commerce, where it says:

Because it was drafted primarily with bilateral agreements in mind, the existence of necessary power in the President with re-

spect to nonparticipants in a broadly based multilateral agreement is questionable.

The people who are asking for this bill themselves say that is so, whether you have more than one bilateral trade agreement. I am quoting from the letter of the Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. COOLEY. The provisions of the original section 204 gave authority to the President to negotiate and to consummate multilateral agreements with foreign countries. I know what was intended, because I drafted and presented the amendment which was adopted and which became section 204 in the bill, H.R. 12. The bill now under consideration only gives the President additional power and authority to deal with countries which are not parties to the multilateral agreement recently signed in Geneva. Much good was accomplished by the unilateral agreement with Japan, and much more good should be accomplished by the multilateral agreement recently consummated in Geneva.

I repeat, that the authority which we now propose to give to the President would enable him to protect the integrity of the Geneva agreement. Without this authority, other nations not signatories to the agreement might flood our markets with imports and completely destroy the effect of the agreement. We understand the provisions and the purposes of the pending measure. Legislative history shows that Congress intended to give to the President the right to negotiate multilateral contracts or agreements with foreign countries.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Then we had better send the bill back for more consideration.

Mr. COOLEY. We are pleased with the bill and regret very much the gentleman is not pleased with it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from South Carolina.

(Mr. HEMPHILL asked and was given permission to revise an extend his remarks.)

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Chairman, I take this time first to thank the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], and his entire committee for this bill and for considering the problem of our textile people; and I want to thank also the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] for his contribution to and help to an industry which is so depressed.

On page 15 of the hearings on this bill we find what this bill is all about, in case there is any question in your mind. The Under Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Price, upon being asked by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE], "How do these people go about gaining an advantage over the participating countries?" answered: "Due to a lack of present legal mechanism there is no action that can be taken by the President or by the executive branch to enforce a request for restraint from a nonparticipant. Therefore, a nonparticipant

could flood the market in any given category for textile products without being able to prevent them."

So the question is simply this, whether you sit on this side of the aisle or that side of the aisle, or whether you have textiles in your district or not, do you want the President to have the power to prevent the importation of textiles, which can be a pattern for other industries which may be affected? I hope there will be a pattern for all industries affected. Or do you want to say to the textile people, let our friends and our enemies bring in all they want.

I have not been here very long, but I have voted for power dams, irrigation projects, and things of that nature in places in the Far West where I have never been. I have never asked, "What are my people getting out of it?" I did not do that because this is my country and I want to help every part of my country and I want help when I need it.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEMPHILL. I happily yield to the gentleman from North Carolina, a fighter for rights and preservation of the textile industry and its people.

Mr. WHITENER. The gentleman referred to the hearings before the Committee on Agriculture. I think it may be well to call to the attention of the House an answer which the Assistant Secretary of Commerce gave to a question asked by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY]:

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Price, how do you reconcile the restrictive arrangement anticipated under this authority with the administration's goal of freer trade?

Mr. PRICE. The long-term arrangement does provide, Mr. Congressman, for a considerable freeing of world trade in cotton textile products. For example, the European Economic Community has agreed, as part of the long-term arrangement, to double its taking of textiles over the 5-year period from the five principal developing countries.

As far as this country is concerned, obviously, we have a most vital interest in the 2,100,000 employees of this industry, which is one of the two largest employers of labor in this country. It is an industry which has suffered some considerable decline in past years, and we are desirous of shoring it up to the extent that we can.

I am sure the gentleman from South Carolina will agree with me that it is high time that we do some shoring up of this industry.

Mr. HEMPHILL. I thank the gentleman, and I agree with him thoroughly. He is always on hand to help when textile problems are the issue.

We have to realize that we have a lot of industries in America, and tomorrow I may be voting to help some other industry because it is an American industry and American jobs are at stake, and I am not going to have a "dog in the manger" attitude because it does not help my particular section. I think that should be the consideration here.

This is not the overall textile question. The legislation today only closes one gap, one loophole in the Geneva agreement. As a matter of fact, it honors our word, and implementation of our word given in those agreements.

In 1960, while campaigning, I told the textile people of South Carolina that the Republicans had never done anything for the textile people and never intended to. The Eisenhower administration made a lot of false and vacant promises and the only time they ever showed any interest in the textile people was in the hope of either getting some favorable vote from those of us in the textile areas or some campaign money for the Republican Party. Today, I find the Republican Party is again fighting against the best interest of the textile people—they are saying, "What is in it for me"? I, in turn, tell them what is good for the textile industry is good for the country. This they ignore and I intend to tell my people again of the antagonism of the Republican Party against the textile people. A vote against this legislation is a vote against the textile industry and the textile people from Maine to Florida, from Georgia to Texas and Arkansas.

I strongly urge the passage of this legislation.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ALFORD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. Sixty-six Members are present, not a quorum. The clerk will call the roll.

The clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 66]

| | | |
|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Anderson, Ill. | Gavin | O'Brien, Ill. |
| Andrews | Grant | O'Hara, Ill. |
| Ashley | Gubser | O'Hara, Mich. |
| Auchincloss | Hansen | Patman |
| Barrett | Harris | Phillips |
| Battin | Harrison, Va. | Pillion |
| Blitch | Harsha | Powell |
| Boggs | Healey | Pucinski |
| Boykin | Hébert | Rains |
| Breeding | Hechler | Rhodes, Ariz. |
| Brewster | Herlong | Roberts, Ala. |
| Buckley | Hoffman, Ill. | Roosevelt |
| Cahill | Hoffman, Mich. | Rostenkowski |
| Cederberg | Hollfield | St. George |
| Chelf | Huddleston | Schwengel |
| Church | Jarman | Scott |
| Collier | Jennings | Selden |
| Corman | Jones, Ala. | Shelley |
| Curtis Mass. | Kee | Sheppard |
| Davis, Tenn. | Kelly | Smith, Miss. |
| Dawson | Kirwan | Spence |
| Derwinski | Klitchin | Springer |
| Diggs | Kluczynski | Staggers |
| Dingell | Lankford | Steed |
| Donohue | Lesinski | Stratton |
| Dowdy | Libonati | Teague, Tex. |
| Dwyer | McVey | Thompson, La. |
| Fallon | Mathias | Thompson, N.J. |
| Fascell | Michel | Tollefson |
| Finnegan | Miller | Van Pelt |
| Flynt | George P. | Walter |
| Frazier | Morrison | Weis |
| Friedel | Moulder | Whitten |
| Fulton | Murphy | Wilson, Ind. |
| Garmatz | Nix | Yates |

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 10788, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 333 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. COOLEY. I would like to ask whether or not our friend from Maine has further requests for time.

Mr. McINTIRE. I have no further requests for time.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 is amended by inserting the following after the first sentence thereof: "In addition, if a multilateral agreement has been or shall be concluded under the authority of this section among countries accounting for a significant part of world trade in the articles with respect to which the agreement was concluded, the President may also issue, in order to carry out such an agreement, regulations governing the entry or withdrawal from warehouse of the same articles which are the products of countries not parties to the agreement."

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FINDLEY: On page 1, line 5, after the word "if" strike out "a multilateral" and insert "an".

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, it seems clear from the discussion on the floor today that the President already has authority to enter into multilateral agreements. I am sure my colleagues agree with me that we should not clutter up our statute books with unnecessary words. The effect of this amendment is simply to take out the word "multilateral" and leave the authority of the President as it was in the original section 204.

I would like to invite the attention of my colleagues to a statement made by the Secretary of State on February 21. He said:

Either we believe in capitalism, in the freedom of individual enterprise, or we do not. And we do not if we hold with massive government intervention to distort and freeze the market. If we look to government to rig the game, we may as well look to it to play the hands.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I call attention to the language of the bill now under consideration which reads as follows:

In addition, if a multilateral agreement has been or shall be concluded under the authority of this section among countries accounting for a significant part of world trade in the articles with respect to which the agreement was concluded.

It is clear to me that the word "multilateral" should be retained in this bill; because, if it is stricken out and "unilateral" put in the bill the President might conclude an agreement with only one nation involving only a small part of world trade in one commodity or article, and certainly you would not want to give the President the power conferred by this provision to impose restrictions on all the other nations of the world. This only comes into play when multilateral agreements have been concluded and covering transactions involving a

substantial part of world trade in the particular commodity.

Mr. FINDLEY. If it will serve to clarify the matter, my amendment did not use the word "unilateral." My amendment will simply take out the words "a multilateral." Those two words will come out.

Mr. COOLEY. Then it will read: "If an agreement has been" —

Mr. FINDLEY. Correct.

Mr. COOLEY. It would also give the President the power to deal with all the other nations of the world.

Mr. FINDLEY. You would give him the authority intended to be conveyed to him in the original section 204, whatever that authority amounts to?

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. Would not the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois greatly increase what is alleged to be the arbitrary power of the President, in that it would allow the President to promulgate these regulations dependent upon only one agreement anywhere in the world; whereas the bill, as the committee has brought it before the House, simply provides that the President may maintain effectively the agreement he has made with nations that represent a substantial portion of the imports?

Mr. COOLEY. A significant part in world trade.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CURTIS of Missouri: Page 1, line 1, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 is hereby repealed."

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, some have asked me whether or not this amendment will gut the bill. The answer is, of course it will. The purpose is to prevent the gutting of the Reciprocal Trade Act. Certainly, gentlemen like the gentleman from Maine, who are strongly in favor of protectionism and would seek any means they could to bring this about, will take a different position. But we are going to have on the floor of the House, I expect sometime around the first of May, a Reciprocal Trade Act with proposals and philosophies that are directly contrary to this particular section 204, particularly as it is amended. I might even say to those who are protectionists, that in certain respects I join with them because I feel that free trade is based upon fair trade, and in order to get free trade we have to spell out some of the things that amount to fairness, and we have not had fair trade, particularly in the field of textiles. There has not been reciprocity.

I have tried for years to spell out procedures in reciprocal trade, the escape clause, the defense clause, and others,

which would permit industry and labor to come in and present their case as they see fit and as they could do according to law and get relief. I regret that they have not been able to in the past.

Again speaking for those who seek to have protection, this kind of clause, section 204, as I tried to point out in my remarks in general debate, is one that gives you no protection at all. It is turning power over to whoever is the executive. He does not have to give you relief. As a matter of fact, he can konk you under this clause and can sell you completely down the river. This is a two-edged sword. Do not think it is one way simply because the textile people were able to work this deal out. They can turn right around on you next year and gut you.

I say that this kind of government by men, which this provides, instead of a government by law, is exceedingly dangerous. This is a vote that I hope we can get on the record, and I wish that the Members would read and consider very carefully how they vote on this amendment and this legislation.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder why the gentleman who just addressed the House did not oppose section 204 when it was originally enacted in 1956. Now, pursuant to the authority contained in section 204, in which Congress conferred upon the President the right to negotiate settlement agreements, the President entered into those agreements, consummated and concluded the agreements. President Eisenhower used section 204 very successfully with Japan and the agreement has worked well. Japan has lived well within the limits of those self-imposed quotas.

Now, would we not be in a ridiculous position to allow representatives of our Government to go all the way to Geneva and negotiate a settlement agreement under authority conferred by Congress, and then come back here today and find we have repealed the authority?

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment be voted down.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS]. I appreciate the gentleman's concern relative to the authorizations under section 204. Mr. Chairman, negotiations under this provision have been made before and additional negotiations have been made more recently in Geneva. It is a most serious action on the part of the Congress to rescind outstanding legislation. We are here not for the purpose of repealing existing law but simply to amend existing law to provide that it be made more effective in supporting the agreements which were made under section 204.

Now, I join with the gentleman from Missouri in his concern relative to government by men, but I would call his attention, as I know he is well aware of the fact, that under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act the escape clauses

provide that the aggrieved parties may appear before the Tariff Commission and that the Tariff Commission recommendation then goes to the President, and the President has the authority—one man in this instance—under that act to decide what action he shall take on the basis of the facts and the recommendations referred to him by the Tariff Commission.

Now, it is true that the procedures under section 204 are certainly not in the same context, but I would point out to the committee that the textile industry has proceeded under the provisions of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. They have proceeded under the provisions of section 22 in which they made the case that their commodity was suffering from impact of imports, which had a bearing on price support programs on cotton. I appreciate the points made by the gentleman from Missouri, but I would certainly urge this committee not to support this amendment.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McINTIRE. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. The gentleman said the procedures under section 204 are different from those under these other sections of the Reciprocal Trade Act. Might I ask the gentleman if it is not true that there are no procedures at all spelled out in section 204?

Mr. McINTIRE. I would agree with the gentleman from Missouri that there are no procedures under section 204. However, I am certain that when we review all of the approaches that are provided in the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act for correction, then all of this would be a part of the analysis of any Chief Executive before he would proceed under section 204.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the Members of the House should realize the tremendous authority that is conferred to the President under section 204. He has ample authority under this section to rig the world market in any agricultural commodity, in any agricultural commodity product, in any textile or textile product. This section is far more fundamental to our trade policy than the bill that is now before the Ways and Means Committee. It would confer far greater authority upon the President. It would place no time limit on that authority. It provides no congressional review whatever. It authorizes a discriminatory, punitive type of trade restriction.

Mr. Chairman, if we want to strengthen private enterprise and promote free trade relations, this section moves in exactly the opposite direction.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending bill and amendments thereto close in 15 minutes, 2 minutes reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the pending bill and amendments thereto close in 15 minutes, 2 minutes reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina.

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. COOLEY and Mr. CURTIS of Missouri.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 95, noes 51.

So the motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KYL].

(Mr. KYL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to take this time simply to thank the gentleman from the South for assisting me in clarifying a couple of issues. I have here a copy of H.R. 9900 which has been called the most important bit of legislation to come before the House in the last decade. Section 102, the statement of purposes, says:

SEC. 102. STATEMENT OF PURPOSES.

It is the purpose of this Act, by lowering trade barriers through trade agreements affording mutual benefits, to stimulate the economic growth of the United States, maintain and enlarge foreign markets for the products of United States industry and agriculture, and make available to the hope of the United States a greater variety of goods at lower prices; to strengthen economic and political relations with the European Economic Community and foreign countries through the development of an open and nondiscriminatory trading system in the free world; to assist in the sound economic progress of countries in the earlier stages of economic development; and to counter economic penetration by international communism.

And so on.

Frankly, as I have read this bill since its introduction I have asked myself, "How could you possibly vote against such a noble statement of principle?" And then today we have presented for us the answer, because this deathless prose which appears in H.R. 9900 was apparently not in complete good faith.

On page 2 of the hearings on the bill which we are debating today, H.R. 10788, we find that that bill was introduced at the request of the Secretary of Commerce, contained in an executive communication to the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Its enactment has been recommended by the Departments of State, Labor, and Agriculture. Representatives of producers and textile groups appeared at the hearings on the bill to support its enactment; and there were no opposition witnesses.

Thus, Mr. Chairman, this has been a day of decision for me. Here we have two divergent, almost diametric propositions, the second supported by almost every department of the Federal Government and by my esteemed and re-

spected friends from the South who need help. So I am going to vote in their behalf today in favor of this bill. This probably means that in the interest of consistency I shall not be able to support the other program which will come up later. Certainly, in their endorsement of H.R. 10788, the various executive departments have taken all logic out of any argument they may conveniently make later in support of H.R. 9900.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, if I may submit a parliamentary inquiry, does the Chair wish to dispose of the pending amendment first? I have an amendment to offer.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman's amendment a perfecting amendment?

Mr. GROSS. No; it is an amendment to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. That would be a perfecting amendment, the Chair will state.

Mr. GROSS. Then, Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Gross: On page 1, line 12, strike out the period and quotation marks and insert a colon and add the following: "Provided, however, That no agreement in regard to cotton and cotton textiles shall be enforced pursuant to the provisions of this section until such time as the President has negotiated agreements with representatives of foreign nations limiting in like manner the export to the United States from foreign countries of the following commodities: Beef and beef products, pork and pork products, fresh and frozen lamb, poultry and poultry products, and dairy products."

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would simply bring all the farmers of this country under whatever benefits there are in this bill. I am sure Members of the House are interested in the welfare of the farmers of Iowa, Illinois, Minnesota and all the great food producing States as well as the cotton farmers of the South.

My quarrel with this bill is that it is in the nature of special privilege legislation for the cotton farmers and cotton textile people. It is protection for them that is denied others. I believe in protection for Americans and I might even be susceptible to being argued into supporting this bill if my good friend from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] would walk down the primrose path to the rose garden in the well of the House and tell us today that when extension of the Trade Agreements Act comes up for consideration soon, he will support provisions in that act to stop the importation of ham from Communist Poland and elsewhere, beef imports from South America and Mexico, the importation of frozen lamb from Australia and New Zealand and many other products of this nature from all over the world. I would be delighted to see my friend hit the sawdust trail, today and tell us we will have his support when the rest of the farmers of

America need it. I do not believe he is going to accept my invitation.

My amendment is reasonable. It will spread the good things of life to all the farmers of this country, not just a comparatively few in the South. I am a protectionist for all and I urge adoption of my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GROSS) there were—ayes 46, noes 76.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FINDLEY: On page 1, line 12, after the word "agreement" strike out the period and insert a colon and the following: "Provided, That section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 shall expire after June 30, 1963."

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I think it is worth while to take notice of the fact that on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa only Democrats rose in favor of the amendment which would have brought equal rights to the farmers of America.

The purpose of the amendment just read would be to put a time limit on the vast authority to rig world markets which would be conveyed to the President under this bill. It seems to me unwise on the part of the Congress to grant to the executive department such vast authority without time limit and without providing any congressional review. My amendment simply would prevent any agreements under this section after June 30, 1963.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I only want to say I hope both amendments will be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 10788) to amend section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956, pursuant to House Resolution 589, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. FINDLEY. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FINDLEY moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 10788, to the Committee on Agriculture with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "Section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956, as amended, is hereby repealed."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GROSS. The motion to recommit as presented to the desk is not the one read.

The SPEAKER. Does the Chair understand the gentleman to say that the motion to recommit was incorrect, or that the gentleman intended to offer another motion to recommit?

Mr. GROSS. The motion read was incorrect.

The SPEAKER. Without objection the action taken on the motion to recommit will be vacated.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois offers a motion to recommit which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FINDLEY moves to recommit the bill to the House Committee on Agriculture with instructions to report the bill to the House forthwith with the following amendment: "On page 1, line 12, strike out the period and quotation marks, insert a colon, and add the following: 'Provided, however, That no agreement in regard to cotton and cotton textiles shall be enforced pursuant to the provisions of this section until such time as the President has negotiated agreements with representatives of foreign nations limiting in like manner the export to the United States from foreign countries of the following commodities: Beef and beef products, pork and pork products, fresh and frozen lamb, poultry and poultry products, and dairy products.'"

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present and object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Under the order of the House previously entered into further proceedings on this bill will be postponed until tomorrow.

Does the gentleman withdraw his point of no quorum?

Mr. FINDLEY. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the point of no quorum.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COOLEY. I did not hear the Chair's ruling on whether or not a quorum was present. Will the Chair advise me what the parliamentary situation is with respect to the point of no quorum?

The SPEAKER. The parliamentary situation is that the point of order was withdrawn, and that pursuant to the order of the House of last Thursday, further consideration of the bill is postponed until tomorrow.

CORRECTION OF ROLL CALL

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, on roll call No. 65 I am recorded as absent. I was present and voted "yea." I ask unanimous consent that the permanent Record and Journal be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

OUR NATIONAL POLICY AND CIVIL DEFENSE

(Mr. REUSS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.)

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, no civil defense program can hope to succeed unless it is closely related to the entire constellation of our national policies. I propose to discuss the foreign policy objectives of the United States; the major foreign threats to their accomplishment; the military response of the United States to the Communist challenge; and then to place civil defense within this context.

I. OUR NATIONAL GOALS—PEACE, FREEDOM, AND JUSTICE

Liberty and independence are, of course, our guiding objectives. This Nation was born in revolution to secure these goals, and we are still strongly committed to their preservation here on this continent, and to their worldwide dissemination.

Our basic goal remains the same—

President Kennedy noted in his second state of the Union message—

[It is] a peaceful community of free and independent states, free to choose their own future and their own system so long as it does not threaten the freedom of others.

This objective informs every national action we take. To reject it would be tantamount to a rejection of our heritage and our way of life.

In working to keep our independence, we will do everything in our power to support the freedom of others. We will not abandon other freedom-loving nations simply to save ourselves. Our moral duty to our ideals and practical political necessity compel us to adopt this course. We have, therefore, not given up hope for the future liberty of those nations which presently suffer under communism's tyrannical rule. Our yearly proclamation of Captive Nations Week indicates our continued

refusal to forget the nations behind the Iron Curtain.

Not are we willing to cut our close ties with our allies for material gain or short-term security.

To those old allies whose cultural and spiritual origins we share—

Said President Kennedy in his inaugural address to the Nation—

We pledge the loyalty of faithful friends.

We display this loyalty by adhering to NATO and by encouraging the economic and political integration of Europe.

THE NEW NATIONS

We also welcome the many new nations which are today asserting their independence after long years of colonial domination—in some cases lasting centuries. We harbor no aggressive design on their desire for freedom. Indeed, we have given our wholehearted support to some 40 new nations, embracing about a billion people, in the past 15 years. We sympathize with the natural desire of peoples everywhere for national independence. We hold no brief for colonialism of any sort—whether of the old style characterized by Kipling's "White Man's Burden" or of the new brand adopted by Khrushchev and the Soviet Union. Adlai Stevenson has captured the spirit of our opposition to colonialism and our support for the many Asians and Africans who are striving to secure their new-won freedoms, in saying:

Americans do not fear the winds of change and the winds of freedom which are blowing across so much of the world. To us they make a wonderful sound. And as the seeds which they carry take root and grow, we will feel that America's great purpose in this world is being fulfilled.

Freedom and independence for the new nations must be accompanied by economic growth, social justice, and political democracy. Our aid programs, our Peace Corps, and our diplomacy are directed toward these ends.

We support the United Nations as a vehicle of peace and eventual international order. Presidents Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower, and Kennedy—Presidents of both parties—have all emphasized the deeply felt loyalty of the Nation to the United Nations. Since its inception over 16 years ago, the United Nations has had no stronger or more faithful friend than the United States. Our fealty has not gone unrewarded. The effective way the United Nations has handled such problems as the Congo, Suez, and the North Korean aggression has clearly vindicated our initial faith in it.

THE UNITED STATES AND THE U.N.

In supporting the U.N. we pledge ourselves to peace and the principle of peaceful settlement of international conflicts. As President Kennedy has said, the United Nations is our last best hope in an age where the instruments of war have far outpaced the instruments of peace. It provides an international forum where the views and grievances of every nation, large or small, may be aired. It supplies a framework within which international disputes may be

amicably settled or adjusted without any nation being compelled to resort to force to achieve its objectives.

Lastly, our peaceful intentions are concentrated on a sincere desire to end, or at least to control, the ever-expanding arms race on both sides of the Iron Curtain. Mankind today possesses the power to destroy itself unless differences among nations can be peacefully resolved. The awful specter of nuclear war with all its attendant suffering and misery hangs over our heads like a sword of Damocles. Never before in the history of man has there been a more pressing need for the successful adoption of an effective, worldwide disarmament agreement. And never before, with a world torn by ideology and political interests, has the goal of a peaceful world seemingly been more distant.

THE PROSPECTS FOR DISARMAMENT

Nevertheless, this Nation must seize every honorable opportunity to reach a disarmament agreement with the Communist world. The stakes are nothing less than the future of the Nation and of all mankind. It is comforting to know that the President is making every effort to secure a workable disarmament agreement based on an effective inspection system. Congressional acceptance of his Disarmament Agency proposal and his continued pronouncements in favor of a just and honorable end to the arms race reinforce his abiding commitment to the cause of peace. While the prospects of reaching an arms accord are not bright, especially in light of the Soviet Union's resumption of atmospheric atomic testing, we must, as the President has perceptively observed, never fear to negotiate in the name of peace. Success in the field of disarmament, apart from the broader settlement of political differences which have stimulated a massive arms buildup in the first place, will have an important impact on any civil defense program we might develop. We will happily revise downward our estimate of requirements for a truly effective national civil defense effort if we can reach some acceptable agreement with the Soviet Union on disarmament and arms control.

II. THE GOALS OF WORLD COMMUNISM

Although we might like to have it otherwise, our experience with the Communists since World War II can lead us to only one conclusion: that the future we face will be one of protracted conflict rather than of peace. It is important therefore that we understand our adversary. Without such knowledge, we cannot hope to meet the many threats which the Communist camp poses for the free world.

A dispassionate appraisal of the historical record since 1945 will, I submit, expose the true aim of Communist tactics and strategy—world domination. A review of Communist words and deeds over the past 17 years will also reveal the alarming lengths to which Communist leaders are willing to go to achieve this ultimate goal.

THE STALINIST PHASE

Since World War II, our relations with the Soviet Union and the Com-

munist world may be divided into two distinct phases. The first stage lasted from 1945 to the death of Stalin in 1953. This period was marked by the militant, aggressive extension of Communist power and influence around the world. The ideological thrust for the Communist movement throughout this period was primarily furnished by Stalin's interpretation of Marxist-Leninist doctrine. Stalin conceived the world as divided into two irreconcilable camps—one Communist, the other capitalist. The Soviet Union was the indisputable leader of the Communist world; the United States, the foremost power in the capitalist world. Stalin was convinced that a violent collision between those two forces was inevitable—a position very similar to the one now held by the Chinese Communists. Since he was certain that the so-called unchangeable laws of history dictated the ultimate victory of communism, he looked with favor upon the prospect of wars. He fully accepted the Leninist position which was vigorously stated by the Sixth World Congress of the Communist International in 1928.

The overthrow of capitalism—

Affirmed the Congress—

is impossible without violence; that is, without armed uprisings and war against the bourgeoisie. In our era of imperialistic wars and world revolution, revolutionary civil wars of the proletarian dictatorship against bourgeoisie, wars of the proletariat against the bourgeois states and world capitalism, as well as national revolutionary wars of oppressed peoples against imperialism are unavoidable.

The occurrence of World Wars I and II served to confirm Stalin's view of the eventual triumph of communism. He saw these wars as clear examples of the inner decay of capitalism as a social, political, and economic system. To him, Nazi Germany marked the final hour of the capitalist world. Nothing, he felt, could save it after the collapse of the Hitler regime.

STALIN CONSOLIDATES RUSSIAN EXPANSION

Having adopted this warlike doctrine, Stalin was quick to apply it to the chaotic circumstances following the end of World War II. The Red Army proved to be a remarkably efficient instrument of his design for world conquest. For the first time in Western history, Russian armies occupied after World War II half of Europe, from Poland and Eastern Germany in the north to Albania, Yugoslavia, and Bulgaria in the south. Political control soon followed in the wake of military domination over this vast and strategically significant area. Lithuania, Estonia, and Latvia lost their independence and were completely absorbed into the Soviet Union. In November 1945, Marshal Tito, a Moscow puppet at that time, established a Communist regime in Yugoslavia. Two months later, the Albanian Communist Hoxha, a strong Stalinist follower who has recently come under sharp attack from Khrushchev over the policy of de-Stalinization, announced the formation of an Albanian People's Republic. Liberty was next squashed in Rumania, Bul-

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF
BUDGET AND FINANCE

(For information only;
should not be quoted
or cited)

Issued April 12, 1962
For actions of April 11, 1962
87th-2d, No. 56

CONTENTS

| | | | | | |
|----------------------------|-----------|--------------------------|----|---------------------|----|
| Acreage allotments..... | 24 | General supply fund..... | 1 | Research..... | 31 |
| Appropriations..... | 1,7,10 | Health benefits..... | 23 | Retirement..... | 23 |
| Disaster relief..... | 1 | Lands..... | 29 | Rice..... | 22 |
| Electrification...14,18,25 | | Legislative program..... | 7 | River basin..... | 1 |
| Extension work..... | 30 | Minerals..... | 11 | Safety..... | 19 |
| Fair..... | 1 | Peace Corps..... | 3 | Saline water..... | 5 |
| Farm program..... | 2,8,16,27 | Personnel..... | 23 | School lunch..... | 22 |
| Flood insurance..... | 17 | Prices..... | 28 | Small business..... | 1 |
| Foreign currencies..... | 12 | Public works..... | 21 | Surplus food..... | 20 |
| Foreign trade..... | 6,9,15 | Reclamation..... | 13 | Virgin Islands..... | 26 |
| Forestry..... | 4,29 | Recreation..... | 4 | Wheat..... | 24 |

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate committee approved land-use adjustment provisions of farm bill. Senate committee reported supplemental appropriation bill. House committee approved dairy provisions of farm bill. House passed bill for agricultural import restrictions on nonparticipating countries in multilateral trade agreements. Rep. Cooley introduced farm bill.

SENATE

1. SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1962. The Appropriations Committee reported with amendments this bill, H. R. 11038 (S. Rept. 1341), which includes items for ARS, AMS, FHA, and Forest Service (see table at end of this Digest for a summary of these items). The bill also includes \$25,000,000 for disaster relief assistance to States and local governments, \$15,000,000 for U. S. participation in the New York World's Fair, \$20,000 for payment of the U. S. share of current expenses of the Delaware River Basin Commission, \$10,000,000 additional capital for the GSA general supply fund to provide for increased sales, and \$85,000,000 increased capital for the revolving fund of the Small Business Administration. p. 5780

Sens. Williams, Del., and Holland submitted notices of intention to move to suspend the rules for the purposes of offering amendments to this bill. pp. 5782-3

2. FARM PROGRAM. The "Daily Digest" states that the Agriculture and Forestry Committee "continued its executive consideration of S. 2786, proposed Food and Agriculture Act of 1962, and approved with amendments title 1 of the bill -- Land-Use Adjustment -- and approved perfecting amendments to title 2 of the bill -- Agricultural Trade Development -- but did not conclude action thereon, and will meet again tomorrow." p. D270
3. PEACE CORPS. S. 2935, to amend the Peace Corps Act, was made the unfinished business. pp. 5834-5
4. FORESTRY; RECREATION. Sens. Clark, Douglas, Humphrey, Smith (Mass.), Morse, Metcalf, Moss, Hart, Engle, Long (Mo.), Hartke, Long (Hawaii), Fulbright, Cooper, Carroll, Byrd (W. Va.), McGee, and Aiken were added as additional cosponsors of S. 3117, to promote the coordination and development of Federal and State programs relating to outdoor recreation. p. 5783
Sens. Clark, Douglas, Humphrey, Smith (Mass.), Morse, Metcalf, Moss, Hart, Engle, Long (Mo.), Magnuson, Mansfield, Long (Hawaii), Chavez, Bartlett, Cooper, Carroll, Byrd (W. Va.), Williams (N. J.), McGee, Hayden, Church, Burdick, Bible, and Aiken were added as additional cosponsors of S. 3118, to provide for the establishment of a land conservation fund. pp. 5783-4
5. SALINE WATER. Sen. Anderson inserted a report on the survey of the Freeport, Texas, sea water conversion system stating that "important design changes will be required for future distillation plants." pp. 5788-9
6. FOREIGN TRADE. Sen. Keating spoke in favor of his proposal to give Congress the authority to veto foreign trade agreements. pp. 5840-1
7. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Sen. Mansfield announced that the supplemental appropriation bill will be considered next Mon., Apr. 16. p. 5833

HOUSE

8. FARM PROGRAM. The "Daily Digest" states that the Agriculture Committee "Met in executive session and approved subtitle C of title IV (amended, regarding dairy) of H. R. 11222 (a clean bill introduced in lieu of H. R. 10010), the general farm bill." p. D273
9. FOREIGN TRADE. By a vote of 312 to 80, passed without amendment H. R. 10788, to amend section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 to authorize the President to extend import-export controls to non-participants in multilateral agreements regarding agricultural commodities or products or textiles or textile products. pp. 5843-4
Rep. Giaino discussed the impact of the proposed Trade Expansion Act of 1962 on employment in the U. S. and inserted an explanatory statement from the Labor Department on trade adjustment assistance for workers. pp. 5872-3
Rep. Curtis, Mo., inserted several editorials that "raise some serious questions about White House lobbying on the trade bill." pp. 5873-4
10. APPROPRIATIONS. Passed without amendment H. R. 11151, the legislative branch appropriation bill, 1963. pp. 5848-61
The Appropriations Committee was granted until midnight Fri., Apr. 13, to file a report on the Defense Department Appropriation bill for 1963. pp. 5861-2
11. MINERALS. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported with amendments H. R. 10566, to provide for the withdrawal and orderly disposition of mineral

House of Representatives

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 11, 1962

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

James 4: 8: *Draw nigh unto God, and He will draw nigh unto thee.*

Almighty God, grant that in the fellowship of prayer our minds and hearts may be cleansed of all sin and be ennobled and exalted by the purifying power of Thy holy spirit.

In these turbulent and troublous days may we learn the secret of a life that remains unmoved by the miseries and mutations of time and finds its strength and serenity in the sanctuary of the eternal.

We penitently acknowledge that we so frequently surrender cowardly to the epicurean ways of life and allow ourselves to become cushioned in complacency.

Inspire us to always take our stand on the side of that which is good and may we have the courage to follow faithfully the path of truth and righteousness regardless of circumstances and consequences.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on April 10, 1962, the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1451. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elfriede Frischi Rogers;

H.R. 1492. An act for the relief of Ernest John Large;

H.R. 1671. An act for the relief of Edvige Cianciulli;

H.R. 2180. An act for the relief of Eugene C. Harter;

H.R. 2684. An act for the relief of Mohan Singh;

H.R. 3105. An act for the relief of Christine Fahrenbruch, a minor;

H.R. 3376. An act for the relief of George A. McDermott;

H.R. 6082. An act for the relief of Mrs. Vartanus Uzar;

H.R. 6276. An act for the relief of Athanasia Dekazos;

H.R. 6343. An act for the relief of Mrs. Izabel A. Migueta;

H.R. 6740. An act for the relief of Teofilo Estoesta;

H.R. 8422. An act for the relief of Sister M. Theophane (Jane Carroll);

H.R. 8780. An act for the relief of Dr. Carl F. Romney;

H.R. 8781. An act for the relief of Walter Singlevich;

H.R. 8907. An act for the relief of Harry A. Sebert;

H.R. 9612. An act relating to the elections under section 333 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 by the shareholders of the G. L. Bernhardt Co., Inc., of Lenoir, N.C., and

H.R. 10573. An act to grant the American Numismatic Association perpetual succession.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 4. An act to provide for the establishment of the Padre Island National Seashore.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently, a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 67]

| | | |
|-----------|----------------|---------------|
| Andrews | Glenn | Rhodes, Ariz. |
| Barrett | Grant | Rostenkowski |
| Battin | Harrison, Va. | Rousselot |
| Blich | Hoffman, Mich. | Scott |
| Boykin | Huddleston | Selden |
| Buckley | Jensen | Shelley |
| Cahill | Jones, Ala. | Simpley |
| Celler | Kee | Smith, Miss. |
| Chaff | Macdonald | Spence |
| Coad | Michel | Van Pelt |
| Derwinski | Morrison | Walter |
| Dowdy | Norrell | Whitten |
| Fascell | Patman | Willis |
| Frazier | Rains | Wilson, Ind. |

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 391 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD— MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 277)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

In compliance with the provisions of section 10(b)4 of the Railroad Retirement

Act, approved June 24, 1937, and of section 12(1) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, approved June 25, 1938, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress, the report of the Railroad Retirement Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1961.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 11, 1962.

REGULATION OF TEXTILE IMPORTS

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] to recommit the bill (H.R. 10788) to amend section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956.

Without objection, the Clerk will again report the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FINDLEY moves to recommit the bill to the House Committee on Agriculture with instructions to report the bill to the House forthwith with the following amendment: "On page 1, line 12, strike out the period and quotation marks, insert a colon, and add the following: 'Provided, however, That no agreement in regard to cotton and cotton textiles shall be enforced pursuant to the provisions of this section until such time as the President has negotiated agreements with representatives of foreign nations limiting in like manner the export to the United States from foreign countries of the following commodities: Beef and beef products, pork and pork products, fresh and frozen lamb, poultry and poultry products, and dairy products.'"

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 312, nays 80, not voting 44, as follows:

[Roll No. 68]

YEAS—312

| | | |
|-----------|---------------|--------------|
| Abbitt | Baldwin | Breeding |
| Abernethy | Baring | Brewster |
| Addabbo | Barry | Brooks |
| Addonizio | Bass, N.H. | Broomfield |
| Albert | Bass, Tenn. | Brown |
| Alexander | Bates | Broyhill |
| Alford | Beckworth | Burke, Ky. |
| Anfuso | Belcher | Burke, Mass. |
| Arends | Bennett, Fla. | Burleson |
| Ashley | Blatnik | Byrne, Pa. |
| Ashmore | Boggs | Cannon |
| Aspinall | Boland | Carey |
| Avery | Bolling | Casey |
| Ayres | Bonner | Celler |
| Bailey | Bow | Chenoweth |
| Baker | Brademas | Chiperfield |

5843

| | | |
|----------------|-----------------|------------------|
| Clancy | Hull | Philbin |
| Clark | Ichord, Mo. | Pike |
| Cohelan | Inouye | Pilcher |
| Colmer | Jarman | Plrnie |
| Conte | Jennings | Poage |
| Cook | Joelson | Poff |
| Cooley | Johnson, Calif. | Price |
| Corman | Johnson, Md. | Pucinski |
| Cramer | Johnson, Wis. | Purcell |
| Cunningham | Jonas | Quile |
| Curtin | Jones, Mo. | Randall |
| Curtis, Mass. | Judd | Reece |
| Dague | Karsten | Relfel |
| Daniels | Karth | Reuss |
| Davis, | Kearns | Rhodes, Pa. |
| James C. | Keith | Riehlman |
| Davis, John W. | Keogh | Rivers, Alaska |
| Davis, Tenn. | Kilgore | Rivers, S.C. |
| Dawson | King, Calif. | Roberts, Ala. |
| Delaney | King, N.Y. | Roberts, Tex. |
| Dent | King, Utah | Rodino |
| Denton | Kirwan | Rogers, Colo. |
| Diggs | Kitchin | Rogers, Fla. |
| Dingell | Kluczynski | Rooney |
| Domnick | Kornegay | Rosenthal |
| Donohue | Kowalski | Roush |
| Dooley | Kunkel | Rutherford |
| Dorn | Kyl | Ryan, Mich. |
| Downing | Landrums | Ryan, N.Y. |
| Doyle | Lane | St. Germain |
| Dulski | Lankford | Santangelo |
| Durno | Lennon | Saund |
| Dwyer | Lesinski | Saylor |
| Edmondson | Libonati | Schwelker |
| Elliott | Loser | Schwengel |
| Everett | McDowell | Scranton |
| Evins | McFall | Seely-Brown |
| Fallon | McIntire | Shipley |
| Farbstein | McMillan | Short |
| Felghan | McSween | Shriver |
| Fenton | McVey | Sibal |
| Flanagan | Macdonald | Sikes |
| Fisher | Mack | Siler |
| Flood | Madden | Sisk |
| Flynt | Magnuson | Slack |
| Fogarty | Mahon | Smith, Iowa |
| Forrester | Maillard | Smith, Va. |
| Fountain | Martin, Mass. | Spence |
| Friedel | Martin, Nebr. | Springer |
| Fulton | Mathias | Stafford |
| Gallagher | Matthews | Staggers |
| Garland | May | Steed |
| Garmatz | Mcrow | Stephens |
| Gary | Miller, Clem | Stratton |
| Gathings | Miller, | Sullivan |
| Gavin | George P. | Taylor |
| Gialmo | Milliken | Teague, Calif. |
| Gilbert | Mills | Teague, Tex. |
| Gonzalez | Moeller | Thomas |
| Goodling | Monagan | Thompson, La. |
| Granahan | Montoya | Thompson, N.J. |
| Gray | Moorehead, | Thompson, Tex. |
| Green, Oreg. | Ohlo | Thornberry |
| Green, Pa. | Moorhead, Pa. | Toll |
| Griffiths | Morgan | Trimble |
| Gubser | Morris | Tuck |
| Hagan, Ga. | Morse | Tupper |
| Hagen, Calif. | Moss | Udall, Morris K. |
| Haley | Moulder | Ullman |
| Halleck | Multer | Vanik |
| Halpern | Murray | Van Zandt |
| Hansen | Natcher | Vinson |
| Harding | Nedzi | Waggonner |
| Hardy | Nix | Wallhauser |
| Harris | Norblad | Watts |
| Harrison, Wyo. | Norrell | Weaver |
| Harvey, Ind. | Nygaard | Wels |
| Hays | O'Brien, Ill. | Whitener |
| Healey | O'Brien, N.Y. | Wickersham |
| Hébert | O'Hara, Ill. | Widnall |
| Hechler | O'Hara, Mich. | Williams |
| Hemphill | Olsen | Willis |
| Henderson | O'Neill | Winstead |
| Herlong | Osmers | Wright |
| Hoeven | Ostertag | Yates |
| Hollfield | Passman | Young |
| Holland | Perkins | Zablocki |
| Horan | Peterson | Zelenko |
| Hosmer | Pfost | |

NAYS—80

| | | |
|----------------|--------------|----------------|
| Adair | Bray | Findley |
| Alger | Bromwell | Fino |
| Andersen, | Bruce | Ford |
| Minn. | Byrnes, Wis. | Frellinghuysen |
| Anderson, Ill. | Cederberg | Goodell |
| Ashbrook | Chamberlain | Griffin |
| Auchincloss | Church | Gross |
| Becker | Corbett | Hall |
| Beermann | Curtis, Mo. | Harsha |
| Bell | Derounian | Harvey, Mich. |
| Bennett, Mich. | Derwinski | Hlestand |
| Berry | Devine | Hoffman, Ill. |
| Betts | Dole | Johansen |
| Bolton | Ellsworth | Kastenmeier |

| | | |
|-----------|--------------|----------------|
| Kilburn | Miller, N.Y. | Schadeberg |
| Knox | Minshall | Schenck |
| Laird | Moore | Scherer |
| Langen | Mosher | Schneebeli |
| Latta | Nelsen | Smith, Calif. |
| Lindsay | O'Konski | Taber |
| Lipscomb | Pelly | Thomson, Wis. |
| McCulloch | Pillion | Tollefson |
| McDonough | Ray | Utt |
| MacGregor | Robison | Westland |
| Marshall | Roudebush | Wharton |
| Mason | Roussetot | Wilson, Calif. |
| Meador | St. George | Younger |

NOT VOTING—44

| | | |
|----------|----------------|---------------|
| Andrews | Grant | Roosevelt |
| Barrett | Harrison, Va. | Rostenkowski |
| Battin | Hoffman, Mich. | Scott |
| Bilitch | Huddleston | Selden |
| Boykin | Jensen | Shelley |
| Buckley | Jones, Ala. | Sheppard |
| Cahill | Kee | Smith, Miss. |
| Chelf | Kelly | Stubblefield |
| Coad | Michel | Van Pelt |
| Collier | Morrison | Walter |
| Daddario | Murphy | Whalley |
| Dowdy | Patman | Whitten |
| Fascell | Rains | Willson, Ind. |
| Frazier | Rhodes, Ariz. | |
| Glenn | Rogers, Tex. | |

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Walter with Mr. Michel.
 Mrs. Blitch with Mr. Glenn.
 Mr. Barrett with Mr. Battin.
 Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Rhodes of Arizona.
 Mr. Morrison with Mr. Wilson of Indiana.
 Mr. Harrison of Virginia with Mr. Cahill.
 Mr. Frazier with Mr. Jensen.
 Mr. Daddario with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan.
 Mr. Chelf with Mr. Van Pelt.
 Mr. Whitten with Mr. Collier.
 Mr. Rains with Mr. Whalley.

Mrs. BOLTON changed her vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. BONNER changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the bill was passed.

The vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CORRECTION OF ROLL CALL

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 66 I was recorded as being absent. I was present and answered to my name. I ask unanimous consent that the permanent Record and Journal be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

CORRECTION OF VOTE

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 61 I am recorded as not voting. I was presented and vote "nay." I ask unanimous consent that the permanent Record and Journal be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

INCREASE IN THE PRICE OF STEEL

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I am certain the majority of the Members of the House regard with surprise and dismay the announcement that the steel trust

had increased the price of steel by \$6 a ton.

There was a general impression on the part of the President and the country that we had at least a tacit understanding with all concerned with the national economy that wages and prices were for the time being stabilized—industry, labor, transportation, agriculture, the consumer, and the producer—and we had expected teamwork.

And now ruthlessly, selfishly, arbitrarily, those who have most and receive most have snatched away from those who have least a disproportionate share of the national income without reason or justification.

Labor is a collateral beneficiary of the raid. The lowest, unskilled, common laborer in the steel mills draws \$20 a day. The electricians work 25 hours a week—while the farmer with heavy investments works from dawn to dark 6 to 7 days a week for the smallest fraction of such pay.

And yet the farmer pays the larger part of the steel bill. More steel goes into farm machinery than into any other fabrication.

The farmer pays the larger part of the increase. He can no longer hire farm labor. It is practically nonexistent. Machinery is indispensable and every year the price of steel and other inflated costs of production therefore rise steadily. And the farmer's net income drops year by year.

The steel trust announces that the price of steel is \$6 per ton more. And it is \$6 per ton more. Labor announces that the wage of common labor is \$20. And it is \$20. The farmer has nothing whatever to say about his prices, his wages, or his income. He is producing food more efficiently and at lowest cost in hours of labor at union wage scales than any class in the Nation. And his standard of living—his compensation—steadily drops.

Now, the farmer believes in high wages and high prices. He believes the laborer is worthy of his hire. And I have through the years voted for every collective bargaining bill and every wage and hour bill that passed the House.

But the farmer does say—and I ask you humbly if it is not in the spirit of American fairplay—that if everybody else gets higher prices and higher wages and higher income the farmer also is entitled to higher wages and prices and income. If everybody in America gets higher pay and more money and a higher standard of living why leave out the farm stepchild of the family who does more work than anybody and who has increased productivity per hour of labor above that of any class in this or any other country on the globe?

And if it is proposed here to pass legislation pushing the farmer back down the ladder of progress why should not they push everybody else down with him? Let us work together and progress together and prosper together. For in the end no country can prosper permanently half rich and half bankrupt.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

My purpose in submitting this resolution of disapproval is purely technical and is not intended to express any position for or against the plan at this time. The resolution is introduced to set in motion the procedures of the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, which will enable the House to vote on this matter of vital significance.

Under the act, a reorganization plan becomes law unless a resolution of disapproval is passed by either the House or the Senate within a prescribed 60-day period.

Government programs in science and technology are so closely affected with our national security and general welfare that any plan of reorganizing such programs should be thoroughly studied by the Congress before approving or disapproving them. It is hoped that the appropriate committee will study the plan in detail and report its findings to the House so that each Member may exercise an informed judgment in the vote or votes affecting this matter.

Summary of Replies to a Questionnaire— Part 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN R. PILLION

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1962

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, on February 20, 1962, I submitted to each family in the 42d District of New York a memorandum and questionnaire encompassing what I consider to be the most basic and critical issues presently confronting the Nation. In my memorandum, I attempted to present a balanced summary both for and against each issue.

I was most gratified with the response to this survey. The number of returns, and the many valuable and sound suggestions indicate a deep concern and sincere interest on the part of our citizens in both the national and international problems of our time.

The 42d District of New York consists of a small portion of the city of Buffalo, N.Y., and the suburban and rural areas surrounding it. The rural, the industrial, and suburban areas are in relatively the same proportion as those of the entire Nation. It is my opinion that the results of the questionnaire are fairly representative of the views of the country as a whole.

The tabulations of the answers to the questionnaire will be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in four parts. Part 1, appearing in today's RECORD, contains questions and replies on the subjects of United States versus Soviet-Communist relations, and United States-Soviet military power.

Part 2 relates to taxes and fiscal affairs; part 3 relates to budget expenditures, disarmament, nuclear tests, fallout shelters, and United Nations; and part 4 relates to reciprocal trade, education,

medical care, postage rates, and Federal pay. These parts will be inserted in the RECORD on successive days.

The tabulated results for part 1 follow:

| | Yes | No |
|---|-------|-------|
| UNITED STATES VERSUS SOVIET- COMMUNIST RELATIONS | | |
| 1. Do you believe that the international conferences of the world's Communist Parties, pronouncing and agreeing upon principles, policies, and actions is in fact a joint campaign to destroy all non-Communist nations and institutions..... | 6,180 | 461 |
| 2. Do you believe that the 98 Communist Parties acknowledge the leadership of Khrushchev and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in a war upon the free world, despite occasional interparty differences.... | 5,804 | 780 |
| 3. Do you believe that the Soviet-Communist forces are steadily winning their goals of weakening and destroying the free world..... | 5,401 | 1,179 |
| 4. Do you believe that United States and free world policies have been that of vacillation, conciliation, appeasement, and retreat..... | 5,098 | 1,346 |
| 5. Do you believe that the first step in reversing Communist gains is to recognize the Communist organization, its purposes, strategies, tactics, and weapons..... | 5,213 | 1,245 |
| 6. Do you believe that a United States-free world military superiority of at least 1.5 to 1 over the Communist forces is a necessary requisite to an effective political counteroffensive.... | 4,698 | 1,550 |
| 7. Would you support a unified free world effort to neutralize and destroy the international Communist conspiracy by nonmilitary political means..... | 5,426 | 386 |
| UNITED STATES-SOVIET MILITARY POWER | | |
| 8. Would you favor increased draft inductions to avoid another callup of Reserves..... | 5,057 | 1,474 |
| 9. U.S. military costs are 10 percent of national production; Soviet is 22 percent; European average is 5 percent. Should United States require a greater military effort by European NATO nations..... | 6,061 | 438 |
| 10. Admiral Rickover states our Navy is technologically obsolete. Do you favor equipping naval vessels with ICBM's for ICBM mobility and dispersal advantages..... | 5,594 | 538 |
| 11. Do you believe that total U.S. military firepower sufficiently exceeds that of the Soviet..... | 2,254 | 3,644 |

Indians Ask State To Enforce Fishing Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JACK WESTLAND

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1962

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, recently I introduced House Joint Resolution 657 which would clarify the right of a State to enforce its laws in respect to Indians who fish illegally off their reservations. At the time I introduced this legislation, I said that the majority of Indians in my district believe in conservation of steelhead and are opposed to the few Indians who circumvented the laws.

This belief that my Indian constituents are in agreement with the sportsmen and other fishermen of Washington State was reaffirmed this morning when I received a resolution from the governing body of the Tulalip Tribes which set forth its position that Indians who fish

illegally are subject to enforcement of the laws of the State of Washington and calls upon the State game commission to take action against Indians who violate these laws.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the Tulalips and express my appreciation for their support. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the resolution, to which I referred, in the RECORD with a sense of pride and pleasure.

The resolution follows:

We, the board of directors and governing body of the Tulalip Tribes, an Indian tribe and corporation, organized, chartered and existing under, and by virtue of the laws of the United States (secs. 16 and 17, Indian Reorganization Act of June 18, 1934, as amended, 48 Stat. 984) do hereby resolve as follows:

1. That the taking of steelhead trout by Indian people from the waters of the State of Washington which do not adjoin, bound, nor are encompassed within the exterior boundaries of Indian reservations contrary to and in violation of the laws of the State of Washington enacted for the conservation of steelhead is hereby disapproved.

2. That such Indian people so taking steelhead trout should be subject to enforcement of the laws of the State of Washington equally with other citizens without distinction.

3. That the failure and refusal of the game commission of the State of Washington to enforce the laws of the State of Washington and its regulations enacted pursuant thereto in regard to said off-reservation Indian fishery for steelhead is not condoned and said commission is hereby called upon to perform its duty and function by enforcement of the aforesaid laws and regulations before its inaction and resultant removal of law and order inevitably culminates in violence and irreparable injury to persons, their property, and the State's steelhead fishery.

Adopted this 3d day of April 1962, at regular meeting of the board of directors of the Tulalip Tribes by unanimous vote.

Neutrals as Global Bedfellows

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1962

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, as we are all concerned with a reappraisal of the United Nations and its value and effectiveness as an instrument for the promotion and the preservation of peace, I, under unanimous consent, include Mr. William Randolph Hearst, Jr.'s, recent news report on "Global Bedfellows" in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. Hearst's challenging article follows:

GLOBAL BEDFELLOWS

(By William Randolph Hearst, Jr.)

As readers of this column and the Hearst newspapers well know, we have tried consistently to view the United Nations in a realistic but not hostile light and we have frequently looked with skepticism on the strange collection of international bedfellows who call themselves the "neutralist" nations.

Both of these aspects of U.S. foreign policy have been important in the news this past week.

As for the U.N.: The Security Council has been debating the demand by Castro's Cuba that the U.N. act to overrule the Organization of American States which booted out that Communist-dominated island.

Of course, the Cuban gambit was defeated, but the fact that the U.N. dignified Castro's squawk against the family of the Americas points up a statement by Senator HENRY M. JACKSON, of Washington, to the National Press Club Tuesday.

Senator JACKSON, a top figure in the Democratic Party and a stalwart supporter of the Kennedy administration, revived the question of whether the United States is overrating the importance of the U.N.

As for the neutrals, spearheaded as usual by India's weaselly Krishna Menon, they have been busy little moles undermining the Western position at the Geneva disarmament conference.

The question of letting U.S. policy be influenced by these apostles of somewhat spotted morality was raised anew by another important Government servant, John J. McCloy, who has acted as an international negotiator for our last three Presidents.

Let's take a look at the U.N. question first. It is notable that the warning against reliance on the U.N., which Senator JACKSON now issues, has been sounded before by Senator FULBRIGHT, the Arkansas Democrat who heads the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

The Fulbright caveat, as the lawyers term it, came last October in the influential magazine "Foreign Affairs." He urged that the United States place main reliance on an alliance of free nations to meet the aggressive Communist threat, while limiting the role of the U.N.

Criticizing the office of U.S. Ambassador to the U.N. as operating in effect as a second Secretary of State, Senator JACKSON now says:

"The truth is, though we have not often spoken it in recent years, that the best hope for peace with justice does not lie in the United Nations.

"Indeed, the truth is almost exactly the reverse. The best hope for the United Nations lies in the maintenance of peace, and peace depends on the power and unity of the Atlantic community and on the skill of our direct diplomacy."

Just as this column has always emphasized, Senator JACKSON is careful to point out that the U.N. is still a useful avenue of American foreign policy, but that the United States needs more realistic appreciation of its limitations, more modest hopes for its accomplishments.

The U.N. cannot end the cold war, Senator JACKSON adds, but the cold war may destroy the U.N. if the World Organization continues to be treated as an arena for conflict rather than as a place of useful contact between nations.

I must agree with the Senator's basic argument about the U.N., although let's remember that any alliance we are in relies on U.S. power. After all, it is blindness to ignore the fact that the very structure of the U.N. today makes it impossible for it to carry all the responsibilities thrust upon it.

In the first place, the Security Council is emasculated as a force for peace by the Soviet's conscienceless use of the veto.

In the second place, new nations with no experience at international affairs and no real competence at such main issues as nuclear disarmament have grown toward being the balance of power in the General Assembly.

And in the third place, the Soviet campaign to browbeat the Secretariat has undercut the executive.

With those three strikes, how can the U.N. be the ultimate, last-word force for peace that wishful-thinking U.S. policy has increasingly held it to be?

Considering all the built-in faults of alliances, recognized for centuries by statesmen of great powers, there are also advantages.

It is possible, for instance, for allies dealing with specially ornery critters on the world scene to use a whipsaw technique, one be the good guy in the white sombrero and the other the bad guy in the black hat.

A corny device but useful when fighting fire with fire. Perhaps our side ought to make a practice of it in negotiating with the shifty Commies.

But as for letting the U.N. be the decisive force for peace, just take a hypothetical case. Suppose the U.N. General Assembly tomorrow were to vote on a matter directly involving U.S. national security—like maybe 100 to 1 (that one is the United States) that all nations disarm immediately on mere trust—with no inspection safeguards.

We would surely have to take the stand that our one vote was a majority of one, and defeat the resolution, wouldn't we?

On the second point: The tacit assumption of the neutral nations that they possess a moral force of world opinion has come up again to plague us at Geneva—and again they have disproved their own case.

The heart of the matter is the most neutrals—are not neutral. Neither are they ennobling examples of international morality.

At Geneva, therefore, it comes as no surprise that they are putting the pressure on us not to resume nuclear tests under any conditions, or conditions that are meaningless. Wittingly or not, they are playing Russia's game.

U.S.-hating Krishna Menon, for instance, proposed that we should confine ourselves to observation posts outside the Soviet Union to detect any violations of a test ban agreement. It is right up Khrushchev's alley.

President Kennedy's moderate—perhaps too moderate—reply at his last press conference was that even though devices located outside Russia could pick up disturbances, they could not distinguish between earthquakes (of which many occur in the Soviet Union) and nuclear explosions. Hence on-site inspections are essential.

Menon's proposal—in fact, the whole role of neutral nations—turns me once more to John McCloy, whose last government job was President's adviser on disarmament. He has also served as Assistant Secretary of War and High Commissioner for Germany.

Writing in the April issue of Foreign Affairs, Mr. McCloy has some words to say that pertain directly to the unrealistic Menon plan.

"Unfortunately," he says, "very few (countries) have done or are prepared to do the work which is involved in making a real contribution (to disarmament, of which a test ban would be a major step).

"Those who sit on the sidelines and merely chant 'general and complete disarmament' without putting their minds to mastering the difficulties of the problem neither make much of a contribution nor are they apt to influence those whose efforts are more serious."

It is when he gets to talking about the "moral" position of the "neutrals" that Mr. McCloy really calls the turn. Quoting again:

"For some time much emphasis has been placed upon the existence of moral opinion among the smaller nations. All through 1960 and 1961 movements were developing . . . against any resumption of nuclear or thermonuclear testing, and some of them were couched in rather high moral tones.

"These pressures were mainly directed against the United States.

"Yet when the Soviet Union suddenly resumed tests on an extensive scale, and coupled this action with threats of 100-megaton bombs, the reactions among the neutral and nonaligned countries at Belgrade and again, to some extent, at the General Assembly of the United Nations, were so mild as to be wholly inconsequential.

"The tendency of these nations seems to have been to moderate their criticism against those whom they fear and to direct their main blasts against those whom they don't fear", meaning respectively the U.S.S.R. and the United States of America.

Then, alluding to India's invasion of Goa, Mr. McCloy winds up:

"A leading neutral's cynical attitude in respect to the use of force, and the tacit acceptance of the dangerous doctrine of good wars and bad wars, put still more in doubt whether a strong moral opinion in fact exists among the neutrals and whether even where it does exist it counts for very much."

In conclusion I go back to our late great Secretary of State John Foster Dulles and a speech he made June 9, 1956, at Iowa State College.

He spoke of the principle of neutrality, which pretends that a nation can best gain safety for itself by being indifferent to the fate of others.

He continued:

"This has increasingly become an obsolete conception and, except under very exceptional circumstances, it is an immoral and shortsighted conception."

It is probably useless to expect the non-neutral neutrals to ponder these things, but I think many of us might profitably consider them.

Regulation of Textile Imports

SPEECH

OF

HON. CARL ELLIOTT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 10, 1962

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 589 and ask for its immediate consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require, after which I shall yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 589 calls up for consideration H.R. 10788, a bill which amends section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956. This bill comes before the House under an open rule with 1 hour of general debate.

Section 204 of the Agricultural Act authorizes the President to negotiate agreements with foreign governments providing for limitation of imports of any agricultural commodity or products, including textiles or textile products. Section 204 also authorizes the President to issue regulations implementing those import agreements.

But before discussing the details of the amendment to this section, let me sketch briefly the background of the problem with which the bill deals; namely, the rise in cotton textile imports.

During the 4-year period from 1934 to 1938, cotton textile imports into the United States from all sources averaged \$39.7 million annually. In 1954 the total

was \$76.2 million. In 1955 the figure was \$123.8 million.

By 1960, the value of cotton textile imports has reached \$253.5 million, or more than a quarter of a billion dollars. During this period I have just covered there was a considerable change, of course, in the value of the dollar. But even in terms of what the economists call constant dollars, the imports more than quadrupled from 1934-38 to 1960.

And, what is more of a danger signal, in 1960, for the first time in 45 years, U.S. imports of cotton products exceeded exports.

Stated another way, in terms of raw cotton, the quantity of manufactured products coming into the United States increased more than five times in the 6 years ending in 1960. Imports of cotton manufactures that year were 573,000 bales, as compared with 101,000 in 1954.

This trend that I have been discussing has taken its toll on cotton farmers, textile workers and on textile management alike.

Realizing the complex and very serious problems facing the cotton and textile industry, President Kennedy on May 2 of last year announced a seven-point program dealing with the import problem.

Point 6 of that program called for the Department of State to arrange a conference with the principal textile importing and exporting countries to seek an international agreement under which trade in cotton textiles could be controlled. That meeting was held in Geneva, Switzerland, last July and the result was a 1-year agreement which lasts until September 30, 1962. The President's authority for enforcement, insofar as the participating countries are concerned, is section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956.

At a meeting in Geneva of the Cotton Textile Committee of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, the representatives of 19 nations concluded a long-term cotton textile arrangement.

This arrangement is for a period of 5 years beginning October 1, 1962, replacing the current agreement. Under terms of the new agreement, the United States or any other nation threatened by market disruption in textiles, or any category thereof, may freeze imports for 1 year at the level of the first 12 of the preceding 15 months. If this disruption condition continues, the freeze may be extended for yet another year. Following that, increases in imports are confined to 5 percent a year.

The countries which participate in this new agreement cover 90 percent of the free world trade in cotton textiles. The President of the United States has authority under section 204 to issue regulations to implement this agreement as far as participants are concerned. But he does not now have the authority to prevent countries which account for the balance of world cotton trade from interfering with the new agreement.

H.R. 10788, the bill called up under this rule, would give the President the authority to protect the agreement against the small minority of textile exporting countries who are not partici-

pants. Conceivably, the beneficial effects of this long-sought agreement could be nullified without this bill.

The bill is simple and it merely adds to section 204 the following language:

In addition, if a multilateral agreement has been or shall be concluded under the authority of this section among countries accounting for a significant part of world trade in the articles with respect to which the agreement was concluded, the President may also issue, in order to carry out such an agreement, regulations governing the entry or withdrawal from warehouse of the same articles which are products of countries not parties to the agreement.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the distinguished Committee on Agriculture, and its able and distinguished chairman, Mr. COOLEY, for its fine work on behalf of the cotton and textile industry.

Mr. Speaker, the cotton industry, embracing as it does, cotton growers, textile workers, and millowners and managers, deserves to have this legislation passed as a matter of equity and justice.

I urge adoption of House Resolution 589.

House Resolution 211—Special Committee on Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 11, 1962

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 1961, I introduced a measure calling for the establishment of a Special Committee on Captive Nations in the House of Representatives. This measure is now House Resolution 211. There are not sufficient words to express my profound gratitude and personal delight to the more than 20 Members of the House who joined with me in that most stimulating and very enlightening discussion which took place then on the subject of the captive nations—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 8, 1961, "Russian colonialism and the necessity of a Special Captive Nations Committee," pages 3286-3311.

The popular response to House Resolution 211 has been so enthusiastic and impressive that I feel dutybound to disclose the thoughts and feelings of many Americans who have taken the time to write me on this subject. These citizens are cognizant of the basic reasons underlying the necessity of the proposed committee. They understand clearly the vital contribution that such a committee could make to our national security interests. In many cases, they know that no public or private body is in existence today which is devoted to the task of studying continuously, systematically, and objectively all of the captive nations, those in Eastern Europe and Asia, including the numerous captive nations in the Soviet Union itself.

Because their thoughts and sentiments are expressive and valuable, I include the following responses of our

citizens to House Resolution 211 in the Appendix of the RECORD:

NEWARK, N.J., April 2, 1962.

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: I earnestly urge your consideration of passage of House Resolution 211, the Flood resolution which would establish a permanent House Committee on the Captive Nations.

As mayor of Newark, I have been petitioned on this matter by a large number of our citizens of all national backgrounds. Many of them have referred to the Rusk letters which oppose the committee's formation.

It is their feeling—and I heartily agree, from all available information—that considerable doubt exists as to the true political situation behind the Iron Curtain.

There are strong indications, moreover, that the millions of people—truly enslaved by Moscow because of their location—are waging a relentless war against their oppressors.

Their struggle against the Communist yoke is, to me, admirable and must be encouraged.

I am reliably informed that the formation of such a permanent committee in the House of Representatives would do much to assure these and other captive peoples of our interest and continuing support.

Therefore, accordingly, I ask for the introduction and prompt passage of House Resolution 211.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

LEO P. CARLIN,
Mayor.

MARCH 31, 1962.

The Honorable DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: On behalf of our organization, the spokesman for Americans of Ukrainian descent in Boston and vicinity, I am proud to express to you our sincere thanks for the introduction of the timely resolution and for your continuous efforts to obtain adoption of House Resolution 211. Your efforts to establish a Congressional Committee on the Captive Nations under the Communist domain have our unqualified approval and support.

With a revolution for national independence "a fundamental fact in our era," to quote from President Kennedy's speech at the University of California, the proposed committee is a concrete action to eliminate the confusion about the enslaved nations behind the Iron Curtain. It will bring into the open the Russian Communist colonialism in Ukraine and other captive countries.

In this letter, I would like to take a few minutes of your valuable time to inform you about the work of our committee on behalf of House Resolution 211.

During the observance of the 44th anniversary of Ukrainian independence, American Ukrainians of Boston and vicinity were again informed about the resolution. They expressed their full support for the resolution. They were also asked to write letters to their own Congressmen and urge them to support the proposed legislation.

I am taking the liberty of enclosing herewith copies of my letters of January 17, 1962, to Congressmen MCCORMACK, O'NEILL, BURKE, PHILBIN, CONTE, CURTIS, and LANE, urging all of them to support the establishment of a committee on the captive nations. Please refer to enclosure A. Several Congressmen expressed their open support for the resolution. Copies of these letters are under the enclosure B.

On March 20 and 26, 1962, I wrote to Congressmen SMITH, O'NEILL, CONTE, and PHILBIN. In the letter to Congressman Howard W. SMITH, I urged him to open public hear-

ings on the proposed legislation. Our opposition to the views of our Secretary of State was also stated. The subject letters are in the enclosure D.

In the letter of January 9 to the CBS television network, a proposition was made to dramatize the struggle of Ukrainians and other captive nations on the Armstrong Circle Theater (enclosure C). So far, I have not received an answer.

In conclusion of this long letter, I would like again to express our thanks to you for your continuous work on behalf of the captive nations and wish you the heartiest success in your work in the House of Representatives.

If I can be of any further service to you, please do not hesitate to call upon me.

Respectfully yours,

OREST SZCZUDLUK,
Chairman, Boston Branch UCCA.

JANUARY 17, 1962.

THE HONORABLE JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MCCORMACK: I am taking the liberty of writing you about the forthcoming 44th anniversary of the proclamation of the Ukrainian National Republic which was proclaimed on January 22, 1918, in Kiev. The Ukrainian people asserted their inalienable right for self-determination. The Russian Communists attacked and subdued the young Republic; yet, they have not subdued the spirit of the Ukrainian people to be free.

The observance of the 44th anniversary of free Ukraine is the most appropriate occasion to ask you, Congressman MCCORMACK, to lend your powerful support to House Resolution 211 (87th Cong., 1st sess.). This resolution, as introduced by Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD of Pennsylvania on March 8, 1961, calls for the establishment of a Permanent Congressional Committee on Captive Nations. Such a committee will deal with all captive non-Russian nations. It will become a source from which authoritative and unbiased information on Ukraine and other captive nations will be available to our Government and to all Americans. Moreover, this committee will direct our crusade of freedom and justice for all captive nations under the Communist oppression.

I would like you to know that Americans of Ukrainian descent in greater Boston and surrounding towns, organized in the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc., support wholeheartedly House Resolution 211. We believe that the establishment of a Permanent Committee on Captive Nations will constitute a powerful challenge to Russian imperialism and serve a notice to Communist dictators that the United States is backing its ideal of freedom with concrete action.

Our best wishes to you for a prosperous year ahead.

Respectfully yours,

UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE
OF AMERICA, INC., BOSTON
BRANCH,
OREST SZCZUDLUK, Chairman.

JANUARY 17, 1962.

THE HONORABLE THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN O'NEILL, JR.: On January 22, 1962 American Ukrainians will join Ukrainians in the free world in observing the 44th anniversary of the Proclamation of the Ukrainian National Republic. The free Ukrainian State was proclaimed on January 22, 1918, in Kiev. This state was recognized by many nations. The Russian Communists attacked and subdued, however, the new Republic after 4 years of continuous war. Yet,

the Russians have not subdued the spirit of the Ukrainian people to be free.

On March 8, 1961, Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD, of Pennsylvania, introduced a resolution—House Resolution 211, 87th Congress, 1st session—which will establish a Permanent Congressional Committee on Captive Nations. Such a committee will conduct studies on all captive non-Russian nations under the Communist oppression. It will become a source from which authoritative and unbiased information on Ukraine and other captive nations will be available to our Government and to all Americans.

The observance of the 44th anniversary of free Ukraine is the most appropriate occasion to ask you, Congressman O'NEILL, to support House Resolution 211. We believe that the establishment of the Permanent Committee on Captive Nations would constitute a powerful challenge to Russian imperialism and serve a notice to Communist dictators that the United States is backing up its ideal of freedom and justice for all peoples with positive action. We believe, furthermore, that the establishment of the proposed committee is a must for the 2d session of the 87th Congress.

Our best wishes to you for a prosperous year ahead.

Respectfully yours,

UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE OF AMERICA,
BOSTON BRANCH, OREST SZCZUDLUK, Chairman.

MARCH 20, 1962.

THE HONORABLE THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN O'NEILL: We thank you for your letter of February 26, 1962, and for your interest in the establishment of a permanent House Committee on the Captive Nations (H. Res. 211).

The House Resolution 211, introduced by Congressman DANIEL J. FLOOD and supported by many Congressmen, is now pending before the House Committee on Rules. On behalf of Americans of Ukrainian descent in Boston, Cambridge, and vicinity, I urge you as our Representative and the only Massachusetts Congressman on the Rules Committee to vote for the establishment of a special Committee on the Captive Nations.

The proposed committee will be empowered to gather all data and material concerning the captive nations and make the findings available to our Government and to all Americans. It will become a sort of a national freedom academy, which would produce specialists in the affairs of non-Russian nations, their histories, economic conditions, and their quest for self-determination.

We also call to your attention our objection to the views of our Secretary of State, Dean Rusk, who called Ukraine a "traditional part" of the Soviet Union. Ukraine proclaimed its independence on January 22, 1918, and was conquered 3 years later. We in the United States are supporting the liberation movements in Asia and Africa, but not of those countries that fell under the Communist domain in 1920—Ukraine, Armenia, Georgia, and others. We believe, therefore, that the proposed committee will undertake the study of Russian Communist colonialism in Ukraine and come out with new dynamic policies toward Ukraine and all the captive nations.

We sincerely hope that you will exercise your best judgment and influence among your colleagues on the Rules Committee and you will vote for the passage of the House Resolution 211.

If I can be of further assistance to you in the matter above, please do not hesitate to call upon me. Thank you very much for your support.

Cordially yours,

OREST SZCZUDLUK,
Chairman, Boston Branch.

APRIL 2, 1962.

THE HONORABLE HOWARD W. SMITH,
Chairman, House Rules Committee, New
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SMITH: This is to inform you that the members of our organization are 100 percent in favor of the Flood resolution (H. Res. 211) calling for the establishment of a permanent Committee on the Captive Nations. We sincerely believe that such a committee would strengthen the position of the United States in the cold war and gain the support of many secret allies behind the Iron Curtain. The time has come for the United States to show that the words "freedom," "liberty for all," and "equal opportunity for the enslaved peoples of the world" are more than phrases used to win elections. We also believe that such a committee could do a wonderful and very needed job in informing the American people about the plight of those who are not as fortunate as they are.

We strongly urge you, Mr. Congressman, to consider favorably House Resolution 211 in your House Rules Committee.

Respectfully yours,

MYRON B. KUROPAS.

The 1962 Churchmen's Washington Seminar Was Significant Gathering—Attorney Charles S. Rhyne Delivers Challenging Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 11, 1962

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the 1962 Churchmen's Washington Seminar, a cooperative project of some 15 national Protestant denominations in association with the Washington office of the National Council of Churches, met in Washington, D.C., February 27 through March 2, 1962.

This significant seminar provides an opportunity for religious leaders to study the operation of the Federal Government at its source. During the 14 years of its existence hundreds of church leaders from every State in the Union, plus the District of Columbia and Canada, have come to the Nation's Capital City to participate in the seminars. West Virginia delegates in attendance this year were: Charles A. Thorman, American Baptist, 109 Ivy Street, Weirton, and W. Q. Smith, Presbyterian Church in the United States, First Presbyterian Church, Alderson.

Formation of national policies and administration of the business of government involve wide and complex processes which inevitably affect the lives of all citizens. Through direct contact with Federal officials, group interviews and panel discussions our Christian leaders talk and think about the tasks that can and ought to be carried forward in the interest of better government.

The chairman of the recent seminar was Dr. Malcolm P. Calhoun, secretary of the division of Christian action, Board of Christian Education, Presbyterian Church, United States.

H. R. 10788

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

APRIL 12, 1962

Received; read twice, and ordered to be placed on the calendar

AN ACT

To amend section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 is amended
4 by inserting the following after the first sentence thereof:
5 “In addition, if a multilateral agreement has been or shall
6 be concluded under the authority of this section among coun-
7 tries accounting for a significant part of world trade in the
8 articles with respect to which the agreement was concluded,
9 the President may also issue, in order to carry out such an
10 agreement, regulations governing the entry or withdrawal
11 from warehouse of the same article which are the products
12 of countries not parties to the agreements.”

Passed the House of Representatives April 11, 1962.

Attest:

RALPH R. ROBERTS,

Clerk.

87TH CONGRESS
2^D SESSION

H. R. 10788

AN ACT

To amend section 204 of the Agricultural Act
of 1956.

APRIL 12, 1962

Received: read twice, and ordered to be placed on the
calendar

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF
BUDGET AND FINANCE

(For information only;
should not be quoted
or cited)

Issued May 15, 1962
For actions of May 14, 1962
87th-2d, No. 76



CONTENTS

| | | |
|----------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|
| Agricultural imports.....1 | Hay.....28 | Soil bank.....28 |
| Atomic energy.....9,19 | Lands.....17 | Stockpiles.....18 |
| Civil defense.....30 | Natural resources.....21 | Sugar.....3,27 |
| Farm program.....2,11 | Personnel.....15 | Taxation.....23,25 |
| Feed grains.....14 | Prices.....24 | Textiles.....1 |
| Foreign aid.....22 | Public works.....4 | Transportation.....16 |
| Foreign trade.....6,13 | Purchasing.....29 | Watersheds.....8 |
| Forest research.....5 | School lunch.....12 | Wheat.....10 |
| Forestry.....26 | Small business.....20 | Youth Conservation Corps.7 |

HIGHLIGHTS: House passed resolution to defer proclamation of wheat marketing quotas. Several Representatives discussed Estes controversy. House committee reported bill to revise school lunch fund apportionment formula. Rep. Findley criticized USDA administration of feed grain program. Sen. Williams, Del., charged mistreatment of USDA employee in Estes case. Sen. Allott called for resignation of Secretary Freeman as result of Estes case. Sen. Carroll commended new sugar proposal. Sen. Ellender and Reps. Cooley, Abernethy, and Rogers, Tex., introduced sugar bills.

SENATE

1. AGRICULTURAL IMPORTS. Began consideration of H. R. 10788, to amend Sec. 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 so as to authorize the President to regulate imports of agricultural commodities, including textiles and textile products, from nonparticipating countries of multilateral trade agreements. p. 7683
Sen. Johnston urged passage of the bill as a means of providing protection for "our domestic industries from cheap foreign products." pp. 7682-3
Sen. Mundt, for himself and Sens. Hruska and Case, S. Dak., submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to this bill. p. 7662
2. FARM PROGRAM. Sen. Williams, Del., charged that an employee of this Department connected with certain files on the Estes case had been mistreated, and renewed

his request for a full investigation of the Estes case. pp. 7708-9

Sen. Allott discussed the Estes case and called for the resignation of Secretary Freeman as a result of it. pp. 7721-4

3. SUGAR. Sen. Carroll expressed pleasure that "the principal negotiators on a new sugar program have just about arrived at complete agreement," and stated that he expected "this agreement will give the domestic industry a share of the total quota, a fraction of a percentage point under 60 percent, and it will also give the domestic sugar industry about 63 percent of the growth in consumptive demand over the overall quota of 9.7 million tons." pp. 7681-2
4. PUBLIC WORKS. Sen. Humphrey objected to a unanimous consent request by Sen. Robertson for the referral of S. 2965, the standby public works bill, to the Banking and Currency Committee for study. Sens. Lausche, Bush, Capehart, Saltonstall, and Cooper debated the merits of such a referral. pp. 7665-8
5. FOREST RESEARCH. Sen. Byrd, W. Va., inserted and commended an address by Sen. Stennis at the dedication of the Southern Hardwood Laboratory, Stoneville, Miss., on the importance of forest research. pp. 7678-80
Sen. Miller inserted an article commending the proposed Lewis and Clark Wildlife and Recreational Trailway from Mo. to Ore. p. 7706
6. FOREIGN TRADE. Sen. Miller expressed concern over the possible effects of the proposed trade expansion bill on domestic agriculture, stated that "the Common Market has adopted a completely protectionist policy in regard to agricultural commodities which have been exported from Iowa," and inserted an editorial and article to support his position. pp. 7702-4
7. YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS. Sen. Moss urged enactment of legislation to provide for establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps and inserted an editorial supporting such legislation. p. 7709
8. WATERSHEDS. Sen. Carlson inserted an editorial discussing the opposition of the Association of Kan. Watersheds to authorization of the Woodbine Dam and Reservoir as proposed by the Corps of Engineers. pp. 7663-4
9. ATOMIC ENERGY. Sen. Aiken urged expansion of the cooperative program for the development and construction of atomic-power reactors and contended that the Administration is attempting "to put a roadblock in the way." pp. 7706-8

HOUSE

10. WHEAT. Passed without amendment S. J. Res. 185, to authorize the Secretary to defer until June 15, 1962 (rather than May 15) the proclamation of marketing quotas and acreage allotments for the 1963 crop of wheat. This measure will now be sent to the President (p. 7634). The Agriculture Committee reported a similar resolution without amendment on May 11 (during adjournment of the House), H. J. Res. 710 (H. Rept. 1672), which was tabled. p. 7648
Rep. Feighan discussed the shipment of grain from Canada to Red China and inserted an article, "Allen-Scott Report -- Sino-Soviet Cooperation Evident in Grain Shipments From Canada." pp. 7635-6
11. FARM PROGRAM. Rep. Anderson, Ill., called for "a thorough investigation by the appropriate committee of this House of the shocking events that have apparently taken place, in the case involving Billie Sol Estes." p. 7628

the ideals and to perfect the institutions we cherish as Americans.

The Communists are gambling that our free society will not be able to withstand sustained pressures, that our belief in the dignity of the individual, our tolerance of dissent, and our reliance upon divine guidance will render us unfit for the long pull. My friends, this is precisely where our advantage lies. These are resources which atheistic, totalitarian communism cannot possibly match. It remains for the American people, individually and as a nation, to mobilize and employ them to the fullest possible extent in a concerted, purposeful drive to realize our destiny.

I am convinced that the wave of the future belongs to those who seek to ennoble the spirit of man and not to those who would degrade and enslave it. It is we, not the Communists, who have the irresistible cause.

Now, more than ever before, it is important that all Americans take an informed and reasoned approach to the public issues of the day. We must make every effort to ascertain facts before making judgments. We serve our country well when we avoid the temptation to sound off on matters about which we are not sufficiently informed. While participating fully in the democratic process of discussion and debate, let us each be certain that our participation is reasonable and responsible.

We have both need and room in this country for a wide range of individual opinion and preference. We need no commissar to tell us where the national interest lies. We can have disagreement without disunity, reservations without recriminations, objectivity without indifference.

The task at hand as we see it is not to accommodate Russia or world court opinions. It is to do those things which our minds and hearts tell us will keep America free and her liberties intact, and which will help her rise to her full potential as a leader of the freedom forces of the world.

We are in this fight for the duration, however long that may be. We are in it not to make a good showing, but to win.

It is, I think, not wrong for us to conclude that the American Legion has contributed measurably to the good of America during its first 43 years of life. And having said that, we must immediately say also that all which has gone before can be only a prelude to that which we must now do. No one, and certainly no organization such as this one is entitled to assume that the sum total of its contribution to America already has been made. On the contrary, our task is far from complete.

Freedom does not perpetuate itself. Each generation must make its own contribution to the preservation of its freedom.

As citizens of this great land, and as American Legionnaires, through the years immediately ahead, we must do a number of things: we must stand always for peace, but not peace at any price; for preparedness as opposed to unilateral disarmament; for the American way of life as opposed to foreign ideologies; for law and order as against unbridled violence; yes, and for religion in its broadest sense.

Let us then set our hand to do these things; with pride in the past and with determination and hope for the present and with confidence in the future. Let us so order our efforts that it shall be said of us when we become a part of history that this was an organization which did indeed devote itself to service for God and country.

In the words of Dr. Frank Barnett, we must make certain that no epitaph on the tombstone of a dead America will ever read: "Here lies a nation which died at the peak of its power with its power unused."

This is the American Legion's call to greatness 43 years after the caucus in St. Louis, Mo.

NEW SUGAR PROGRAM WILL HELP COLORADO

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, it is my hope that any hour now the administration will announce that it is sending the Congress new sugar legislation.

I think the principal negotiators on a new sugar program have just about arrived at complete agreement. I expect that this agreement will give the domestic industry a share of the total quota, a fraction of a percentage point under 60 percent, and it will also give the domestic sugar industry about 63 percent of the growth in consumptive demand over the overall quota of 9.7 million tons.

Negotiations on a new, 5-year sugar program have been going on, literally day after day, for months.

Representatives of the sugar beet industry in my own State of Colorado have been in Washington a good part of this year, helping to hammer out an equitable program that would improve the position of the beet farmer, protect the consumer from price increases and at the same time take a step toward greater U.S. self-sufficiency in sugar production.

I believe that the sugar program which will be announced any day now will do all those things.

It is my expectation that the growers, processors, and the administration will agree that in the new quotas the domestic cane and beet growers are entitled to a substantial increase over their previous 53.5 percent share of the U.S. consumption quota. In Colorado an increase is needed to build up inventories cut by heavy losses last year from early frosts.

An increase to almost 60 percent of the new U.S. consumption quota will, I think, be received as good news by our Colorado beetgrowers. This would be an increase of over 6 points and a percentage increase of over 11 percent.

OVERALL QUOTA 9.7 MILLION TONS

Last month the Secretary of Agriculture determined that there was a tightening supply situation in sugar. He raised the 1962 estimate of U.S. sugar needs to 9.7 million tons.

Out of this overall U.S. sugar consumption quota of 9.7 million tons I expect that the domestic sugar industry will, under the new program, supply about 5,790,900 tons. Out of this I expect that the beet sugar growers will be allotted over 2.6 million tons.

In the area of market growth, if the new agreement allocates 63 percent of new annual growth to the domestic industry, this should amount to about 94,500 tons of cane and beet sugar per year, of which about 70,875 tons per year will probably be allocated to the beet industry, the balance to domestic cane.

All things considered, the agreement, which I hope will soon evolve into a new sugar law, looks good for the domestic sugarbeet industry.

The increase in the domestic producers' share of the total quota is several points above the figure originally proposed by the administration early this year, which means that beetgrowers gained an additional 50,000 tons in the bargaining of the past few weeks. I

think the bargainers for the beet industry did well.

COLORADO SUGAR INDUSTRY

The new program will mean much to Colorado.

Colorado is the second largest sugarbeet-producing State in the United States.

Sugarbeets produce \$70 million in annual income in Colorado: \$43 million to farmers and \$27 million to labor in processing plants.

We have more farms producing sugarbeets in Colorado than any other State in the Union: 1,285 farms.

The three sugar-processing companies in Colorado are Great Western, Holly, and American Crystal. When Secretary Freeman last September assigned sales quotas to beet processors these three companies received allotments of 26.7 million hundredweight out of a national total of 48.7 million. This is over half of the total allotment.

Colorado has a large economic stake in sound sugar legislation that permits reasonable and orderly growth of the domestic industry.

I think the new program fits the needs of the Colorado growers and processors.

WESTERN SLOPE NEEDS

The new program should provide an economic lift to several areas in Colorado: the Arkansas Valley, northeastern Colorado, and the Western Slope.

However, it is in the area of the Delta sugar plant where the most help is needed in Colorado, and I think the new sugar law will bolster the efforts there to stabilize the farm economy.

Farmers near the Delta plant have agreed to plant 8,000 acres of beets in 1962 and add 1,000 acres per year until they have 12,000 acres under production by 1966. In 1961 only 6,900 acres of beets had been harvested.

The farmers and businessmen on the Western Slope have shown their faith in the sugar program by pledging money and acreage to keep the Delta processing plant alive.

This new sugar program we are about to see unveiled will give the domestic beet growers sufficient allotments so that new beet acreage on the Western Slope can be made economically sound.

I ask unanimous consent that at this point in the RECORD there appear an article from the Grand Junction Sentinel of January 30, 1962, which describes the remarkable achievement of Western Slope leaders in saving the beet sugar industry in that area, and shows dramatically why this new sugar program is needed to provide opportunities for domestic sugar beet areas to increase production.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SLOPE EFFORT SAVES SUGARBEET INDUSTRY

The western slope sugarbeet industry took a forced look at extinction in the fall of 1961 when Holly Sugar Corp. sized up the last of several years of mediocre beet production and said it would not reopen its Delta plant in 1962.

This meant the loss of more than \$2 million annually in product and labor income to Delta, Mesa, and Montrose Counties. So with the horse as good as stolen, the industry set out to lock the barn.

Holly was queried on what it would take to keep the Delta plant in operation. The company answered that it couldn't consider staying on the western slope unless it got a cash loan of \$200,000 and pledges of 8,000 acres of beets in 1962, increasing a thousand acres a year to 12,000 in 1966. A deadline of January 1 was set for these requirements.

In 1961 only 6,900 acres of beets were harvested. In 1962, it would have to be 8,000 acres or none at all. And \$200,000 would have to be raised or the acreage would mean nothing.

Early in December growers and businessmen in the three counties started soliciting land and money. The effort moved slowly, and a time extension had to be granted by Holly. By mid-January, the \$200,000 was in a trust fund ready to be turned over to the sugar company, and the 8,000-acre quota was topped by more than 1,000 acres.

A guarantee that no penalty would come to investors in the event of Government limits on beet acreage was written into the agreement.

And while the campaign was in full swing, the U.S. Department of Agriculture announced there would be no controls on beet acreage in 1962. This removed a fear of many growers about meeting the acreage requirements.

Investors in the Holly loan fund will get their money back in \$40,000 annual payments over the 5 years, with 5 percent interest.

In addition to keeping the sugar beet business, the Holly agreement served to expand the industry by bringing acreage pledges from 130 new growers.

As these new growers become familiar with beets, the industry can expect vast growth—probably double the present level—in the next few years, observers feel.

AMERICAN TRAVELERS ABROAD HAVE A DIPLOMATIC MISSION

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, recently, Newsweek magazine, as a part of its public service series, published a message calling attention to the fact that 8 million American businessmen, servicemen, tourists, and students travel abroad each year. The impressions which these 8 million Americans make in foreign lands affect very directly our national reputation.

This is a message which performs a genuine public service. Recently, I have been pleased to note that as a part of their regular adult education programs, some school systems have been offering orientation courses for those who plan to travel abroad. This activity should certainly be encouraged.

I ask unanimous consent that the public service message entitled "You Now Have an Urgent Diplomatic Mission," which appeared in the April 3, 1962, issue of Newsweek, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YOU NOW HAVE AN URGENT DIPLOMATIC MISSION

No matter where you travel you can't get out of it: Hong Kong, Mexico, Kenya, Paris, Toronto, Melbourne, Rio.

That's just the place we're talking about.

Ben Franklin was a fine Ambassador. And didn't Jackie get a lot of applause, too? But you're 8 million strong. Businessman, serviceman, tourist, student. Camera around your neck, guide book in your hand. America written all over you, and the whole world watching.

WINDFALL TO BANKS BY REASON OF WITHHOLDING TAX ON DIVI- DENDS AND INTEREST

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I rise today to speak on an unpopular subject, the withholding tax. But, I speak on it because so much misapprehension and distortion of it has been spread about it.

This proposal hurts hardest one broad category of people—those who are unlawfully, either willfully or accidentally, holding out from the U.S. Government better than \$800 million a year in taxes which are due on their income from dividends and interest. It is particularly unfortunate that there should be such a large amount due the Government that is not presently being paid.

Moreover, only 11 percent of the dividends and 29 percent of the interest that is not now being reported is now going to people with annual incomes under \$5,000. So, it is obvious that most of this money that is owed our Government is received by people with income over \$5,000.

From the viewpoint of actual arithmetic, the amount of money that will be recovered by this particular program is estimated to be at least \$613 million.

It is often said that it will cost too much to make it practical. This is completely incorrect. The specific cost to the Federal Government would be \$18 million or 3 percent of the amount collected. And for those who say it is expensive, let us bear in mind the estimate of the Franklin Savings Bank of Long Island, which estimated it would cost the bank seven-tenths of 1 percent of the amount withheld the first year and three-tenths of 1 percent thereafter. This would mean a total cost of 70 cents per \$100 the first year, and 30 cents per \$100 per each succeeding year thereafter. But, the fact should also be borne in mind that the banks and financial institutions hold the payments that are due until they have to be paid over to the Federal Government. In fact, a very good argument can be made that the financial institutions will have a minor windfall; since they will have had the use of the money for that period of time. Specifically, from assuming that the average interest rate is 4 percent and the financial institutions retained it until the last possible day, it can be seen that on an averaging out basis, they will have benefited by 2 percent of the amount withheld. Subtracting the 0.3 percent that it would cost to withhold, we can see that the banks and financial institutions would have made a profit of 1.7 percent on all money withheld.

It has been said that this invokes a hardship on the old, the young, and those whose income is such that they do not have to pay an income tax. This is equally incorrect. All that anybody has to do who falls in any of these categories is to file a certificate stating that fact and they will be exempt. Moreover, under Secretary Dillon's recent proposal, this request would only have to be filed once and would remain in effect until actually changed by the person concerned.

Actually, wage earners have had withholding taxes since 1942. It has proven

a popular, effective, and sensible way of collecting the taxes due the Government. Under the proposed legislation, dividend and interest recipients are treated a great deal more kindly than are wage earners, since wage earners can only apply for a refund on an annual basis, while dividend and interest recipients may do so on a quarterly basis.

It has been stated that tax exempt institutions, such as libraries, charities, and so forth, will suffer. Originally they would have been inconvenienced because they might have had to wait as long as 3 months to receive refunds. However, under Secretary Dillon's proposal, they too would, upon application, remain exempt in the same way as individuals.

The reason for all the hubbub is simple. Too many people are misinformed or are making anguished cries because they have not paid the taxes they should.

To my mind, although inconvenient, this is a sound and good proposal. I wish it were unnecessary. I wish that our fellow countrymen paid their taxes as punctiliously as you and I do. Unfortunately, that is not the case. Accordingly, I intend to support this legislation.

IMPORTS OF CERTAIN AGRICUL- TURAL PRODUCTS

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I urge that the Senate act favorably on H.R. 10788, a bill to give the President power to block the flood of imports to this country of certain agricultural commodities and products, especially in this case, cotton and textile products.

As early as 15 years ago, I foresaw the trend against our domestic textile industry being presented by the increasing flood of cheap foreign textile products manufactured by cheap foreign labor. Only in the past 2 years have we made any headway in really regulating these imports.

Last year the United States reached an agreement with 19 importing and exporting countries for an agreed, regulated flow of cotton textile products. Unless the President of the United States has authority to cut off imports from nations not operating under the terms of the 19-nation agreement, the goal or the purpose of the agreement itself will be useless in the case of cotton textiles. The loopholes presented by nations not governed by the treaty must be closed. This is the purpose of H.R. 10788.

The Senate Agriculture Committee thoroughly studied this matter when it considered S. 3006, companion bill to H.R. 10788. A question was raised in the committee as to whether the terms of the bill—"agricultural commodities or products"—would include lumber, which is an important commodity of many States.

Happily, the committee agreed that such lumber would be included in this bill. Frankly, we need to protect our textile industry, which has been gravely threatened by foreign imports, but we also need to protect our lumber industry.

The plywood industry in this country has been severely damaged by foreign imports, and under the language of this bill and the interpretation placed upon

it by the Senate Agriculture Committee, plywood products would come under this measure.

I want the President to have all necessary power to protect our domestic industries from cheap foreign products. At the present time, no two industries need help more than the textile industry and the plywood industry.

I strongly urge that the Senate approve this measure.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 185) to defer the proclamation of marketing quotas and acreage allotments for the 1963 crop of wheat.

JAMES M. NORMAN—LITERACY TEST FOR VOTING

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none; and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, what is the unfinished business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The morning hour having expired, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 1361) for the relief of James M. Norman.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1361) for the relief of James M. Norman.

THE FARM BILL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate turn to the consideration of Calendar No. 1304, House bill 10788.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 10788) to amend section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on this motion I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield for a question?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I desire to ask about the status of H.R. 1361, which has been passed by the House, and provides for the relief of a constituent of mine, a citizen of my State. The bill was reported from the Senate Judiciary Com-

mittee with a favorable, unanimous report; and the bill is not opposed by any Government agency. As the report on the bill shows, the Senate Judiciary Committee received a favorable report on the bill from the Bureau of the Budget. So I should like to ask the distinguished majority leader about the status of the original bill H.R. 1361.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Until and unless the motion I made a moment ago is agreed to, H.R. 1361 will remain the unfinished business.

But I wish to assure the distinguished Senator from Texas that if and when the pending motion is agreed to, it will automatically carry the unfinished business back to the calendar.

Let me say to the Senator from Texas that I have already contacted the chairman of the Judiciary Committee and other members; and they have assured me that it is their intention to report, at the first available opportunity, the bill for the relief of James M. Norman, and to report it as soon as possible in approximately the same form in which it was previously reported.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I desire to thank the distinguished majority leader for the statement he has made, which clarifies this matter a great deal. I wish to thank him not merely on behalf of this one particular constituent of mine, but, in addition, on behalf of a number of other persons who will be affected.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am quite certain that word will get back in a hurry to Mr. James M. Norman, of west Texas. It so happens that the controversial item which has been under consideration was attached to the bill for this relief, for it happened that at that particular time that was the vehicle which was available in that connection.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I thank the Senator from Montana.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, is it in order to request the ordering of the yeas and nays on the so-called Mansfield-Dirksen substitute?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Not at this time, because at this time the motion of the Senator from Montana takes precedence over the other matter.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the call be terminated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the motion of the majority leader. Before the vote on cloture was taken, the majority leader made a statement in which he said, among other things, "We have done what reasonably can be done at this time."

With all respect, I take exception to that statement. Mr. President, during the debates, those in favor of the bill, which is still the pending business, demonstrated, I think conclusively—and no

demonstration was necessary, because everyone in this country who knows anything knows what the facts are—that grave injustices are being done all the time in a number of States of this Union by the deprivation of people, on the ground of their color, of the right to register and to vote.

Either we accept this fact and face it, or we do not. We have got to accept it, Mr. President. We have got to recognize that this fact exists—this fact of injustice, this fact which is a stain on the escutcheon of this land of ours, this fact which is only a manifestation, but a very important one, of the kind of prejudice which exists in this country, the kind of discrimination which makes this country fall short of its ideals—ideals which we honestly hold, but which some are unwilling to put into practice.

Mr. President, have we done what can reasonably be done at this time? Of course, we have not. It is quite true that there were two votes on cloture, one last Wednesday, one today, and that on each vote less than a majority voted in favor of cloture. Those votes were on a particular piece of proposed legislation.

Mr. President, I suggest there are perhaps four different categories into which Senators who voted against cloture on these occasions fall. First of all, of course, are those Senators who are opposed to all civil rights legislation. There exist a number, but a relatively small minority of the Members in this Chamber, who so believe.

Then there are those Senators who believe that cloture should not be voted on any matter, because of their conception of what the rights and prerogatives of Members of the Senate are and ought to be.

I do not believe those two groups comprise a majority. I suggest they do not comprise even a third of the Membership of this body.

Then there is a third group, undoubtedly composed of those Senators who felt that, even after 2 weeks and more of debate upon this measure, it was too early to vote for cloture.

Of course, I do not agree with that position, but I suggest there are those who felt that way. Therefore, it was a great mistake to require a second vote on cloture so soon after the first one and so soon after its failure, and I suggest that the vote just now had on cloture does not represent the ultimate view of those who voted against it at the time.

Then there is a fourth group, composed of those Senators who feel that this particular proposal in regard to the literacy test is either unconstitutional or unwise, or both.

I do not agree with that view in either part. I think it is quite clearly constitutional, and I think it is not only wise, but absolutely necessary. My views apart from those, there are those who hold that view and hold it very sincerely.

I suggest in the circumstances that the real duty of the leadership is not to accept this cloture vote as evidence of the impossibility of action on civil rights at this session of the Congress. And I suggest, if that is done, it represents a

failure of the leadership, a failure of the leadership in a matter of vital importance not only to those whose rights have been taken away from them and whose rights have been denied for so long, but a failure of the leadership in a matter greatly affecting the future of this land of ours, both in the matter of domestic order and decency and the matter of the position of this Nation in the world.

In regard to civil rights legislation, it is common knowledge—and everyone who knows anything about the Senate of the United States knows this—that the ordinary process by which we develop legislation to cure abuses has not been available for many years in the matter of civil rights. The simple fact of the matter is that the chairmanship of the committee which has jurisdiction of this matter has been in persons who are unfriendly, down to the ground, to civil rights legislation. This is a matter of their own views, and I do not criticize them at this time, although they are utterly wrong in my opinion. I am talking about the leadership, and the ability of our committee system to operate in this problem, and the requirement of real leadership on the part of the Senate as a whole and of its majority and minority leaders. It means we have to go beyond the committee system, and reliance on it, in order to meet this problem.

The two votes had on cloture last week and today do not represent the acceptance of the responsibility that falls upon the Senate majority, or even upon the leadership of our minority side of the aisle.

Those of us who strongly favor civil rights legislation willingly accepted the decision of the majority and the minority leaders that we should limit ourselves at this time to this particular single piece of legislation. We did it, not because it was a cure-all or represented legislation that is most desirable or necessary; it was not because we felt that, even for its own purposes, it was without fault or shortcomings; but we did it because we wanted to assure our cooperation in any effort which we felt was sincere on the part of the leadership on this side of the Senate—and we still do—to provide some remedy, some little step forward.

Mr. President, when it is clear—as it must be to the leadership, since it is to all of us—that there is not a majority in favor of the proposed legislation, then the duty of the leadership, if we are to meet a problem which affects America at home and also abroad, is not to accept this and to go on to something else, saying, "We have gone through the usual gesture which we must go through once every session, or perhaps once every Congress," but to do something about civil rights.

The duty of the leadership is to provide other alternative methods which a majority of the Senate will accept to meet the present problems.

There are many things which ought to be done. Those of us who did refrain from offering amendments to the bill would like to offer as an amendment, for

example, part 3. We would like to offer a provision which would require the States and the school districts to submit, by a date certain, at least the beginning of a plan for school desegregation. We would like to offer proposed legislation to provide financial and other assistance to those school districts which are making honest efforts, some of them under great difficulties, to meet the school desegregation problems.

There are countless other provisions which could be offered, some of which I believe would receive at least majority acceptance.

But no—the leadership has no intention of giving serious consideration to getting the job done; it merely intends to close the door to an unpleasant and perhaps embarrassing problem for this session of the Congress.

This is not the right way for the Senate to conduct itself. This does not represent a meeting of the responsibility of the greatest deliberative body in the world at a time as serious as this time for this country of ours.

I suggest that instead of voting to displace the proposed legislation with the measure which the majority leader has suggested be made the pending business, we should keep the proposal before the Senate. We should probe. We should do our best to find measures on which we can get agreement. We should proceed to take the necessary action, whether by way of cloture or round-the-clock sessions or a combination of these, strongly backed by the majority we find in favor of necessary legislation. We should get civil rights action at this session of the Congress.

Unless we do that, this Congress will go down in history not as one which has met its responsibility but as one which has evaded its responsibility.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an editorial entitled "Minority Rule in the Senate," which was published in this morning's New York Times.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MINORITY RULE IN THE SENATE

This year's Senate debate of the administration's literacy-test bill is expected to end today when the Democratic leader, Senator MANSFIELD, will call up his second motion for cloture and it will be defeated. The situation is ironic. Last week almost two-thirds of the Senators liked the bill well enough to vote against killing it by tabling, but only a minority of 43 could be found to bring it to a vote by cloture. A majority of the Senate does not seem to believe in majority government.

The arguments for practically unlimited of the Senate, Maclay of Pennsylvania congress are familiar, as are the arguments against it. In 1791, in the very first session of the Senate, Maclay of Pennsylvania complained that "the design of the Virginian and South Carolina gentlemen was to talk all the time," not to settle the question of where the National Capital should be located. In 1840 Henry Clay was indignantly proposing a rule "which would place the business of the Senate under the control of the majority of the Senate."

Two generations ago the elder Senator Lodge, of Massachusetts, remarked that "to vote without debating is perilous, but to de-

bate without ever voting is imbecile." Many years later Mr. Lodge possibly violated his own earlier principles when he helped kill the Treaty of Versailles.

The veto power of the Senate minority, which is what the filibuster system actually amounts to, is useful at various times to all sorts of causes—to prevent the ratification of treaties, to delay action on economic and financial problems, even to defeat Presidential appointments.

As matters stand, a cloture procedure requiring a two-thirds vote and allowing each Senator a total of 1 hour to speak on the main question is better than nothing. Yet it is really not of much use. One reform frequently proposed would reduce the number of votes required for cloture to something less than two-thirds but usually something more than a majority.

However, behind the procedural question there is in this situation a question of principle. The ability of a Senate minority effectively to kill a bill does not violate any citable clause in the Constitution, but it does violate the basic principle of the southern registrars of keeping Negroes from voting by distorting the so-called literacy tests. As the President said at his press conference, "It doesn't make any sense." It doesn't make any justice, either.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I hope, since the Senator is a lawyer, he will not mind the length of my question.

Would the Senator give us his view as to the posture of the administration in this matter; bearing in mind that all during last year no civil rights legislation was requested at all, and that the general estimate of the civil rights legislation requested this year, in respect to the two bills relating to poll taxes and the literacy test, is that though they are important measures they fail to represent the really significant achievements in respect of civil rights which are dictated by the situation in the country; and bearing in mind that, when viewed in the light of riots, of freedom rides, of sit-ins, of wait-ins, of pray-ins, and the tremendous militancy which is developing in this field, there must be some way to give tongue and outlet to this feeling by such a tremendous mass of Americans, rather than trying this small salve or band-aid, and then even abandoning that with the first strong wind that blows in the shape of two cloture votes?

Would the Senator also tell us how he compares the amount of administration effort expended in respect to mustering a two-thirds vote for cloture, bearing in mind that it takes a lot of effort to do that, with the administration effort expended, for example, in respect to reorganizing the Rules Committee in the other body?

I would appreciate having the Senator's comments on those matters.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. I think the Senator from New York by his question has correctly evaluated the strength of the administration effort in this regard. It seems to me impossible to conclude anything except that the administration has given this matter a very low priority.

I have seen no evidence of strenuous effort. In fact, I have seen no evidence of any effort whatever except that which has been made by the leadership

Calendar No. 1451

87TH CONGRESS
2^D SESSION

H. R. 10788

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

MAY 14, 1962

Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

AMENDMENT

Proposed by Mr. MUNDT (for himself, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, and Mr. ALLOTT) to the bill (H.R. 10788) to amend section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956, viz:

1 On page 1, line 12, strike out the period and quotation
2 marks, insert a colon, and add the following: "*Provided,*
3 *however,* That no agreement in regard to cotton and cotton
4 textiles shall be enforced pursuant to the provisions of this
5 section until such time as the President has negotiated agree-
6 ments with representatives of foreign nations limiting in like
7 manner the export to the United States from foreign countries
8 of the following commodities: Beef and beef products, pork
9 and pork products, fresh and frozen lamb, poultry and
10 poultry products, and dairy products."

87TH CONGRESS
2^D Session

H. R. 10788

AMENDMENT

Proposed by Mr. MUNDT (for himself, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, and Mr. ALBERT) to the bill (H.R. 10788) to amend section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956.

MAY 14, 1962

Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF
BUDGET AND FINANCE

(For information only;
should not be quoted
or cited)

Issued May 16, 1962

For actions of May 15, 1962

87th-2d, No. 77

CONTENTS

Agricultural imports.....2
Appropriations.....9
Area redevelopment.....28
Budgeting.....29
Centennial.....13
Cherries.....3
Civil defense.....21
Commission.....35
Contracts.....37

Cotton.....18
Dairy prices.....26,36
Disaster relief.....6
Economics.....23
Electrification.....10
Farm program
.....3,9,12,13,24,34
Food industry.....16,22
Foreign trade.....2,25

Grain storage.....34
Hay.....33
Legislative program.....9
Lobbying.....31
Marketing penalties.....11
Monopolies.....35
Older persons aid.....7
Personnel.....30
Public works.....5,9,15,32
River basin.....27
Small business.....8
Soil bank.....33
Stockpiling.....17,18
Sugar.....1
Territories.....20
Transportation.....14
Water pollution.....19
Watersheds.....4

HIGHLIGHTS: House committee reported bill for disposal of extra long staple cotton from stockpile. Senate debated bill for agricultural import restrictions on non-participating countries in multilateral trade agreements. Both Houses received proposed sugar bill. Sen. Mansfield announced farm bill to be considered Mon., May 21. Reps. Pelly and Findley urged investigation of Estes case. Sen. Humphrey introduced and discussed dairy income stabilization bill.

SENATE

1. SUGAR. Both Houses received from this Department a proposed bill to amend and extend the Sugar Act of 1948; to H. Agriculture and S. Finance Committees (pp. 7726, 7817).

The proposed legislation would extend the Act for five years; would increase quotas for the domestic areas at the present level of sugar consumption about 625,000 tons to 5,810,000 tons; would increase from 55 to 63 percent the share of sugar market expansion supplied by domestic areas; and would reduce the portion of the market reserved for future participation by Cuba sufficiently to compensate for the larger basic quotas for the domestic areas. It would require the payment of a fee equal to the quota premium on sugar acquired from foreign countries in replacement for that sugar not imported from Cuba or other quota countries when we are not in diplomatic relations. It also would provide for payment of a progressively increasing fee on sugar imported within the quota prorations for foreign countries other than the Republic of the Philippines so that by 1966 this fee also would equal the quota premium. In each year that sugar beet production is controlled, acreage equal to the requirements of a

modern sugar beet factory would be reserved for assignment to farms by the Secretary without regard to previous production history.

2. AGRICULTURAL IMPORTS. Began debate on H. R. 10788, to amend Sec. 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 so as to authorize the President to regulate imports of agricultural commodities, including textiles and textile products, from nonparticipating countries of multilateral trade agreements, after agreeing, 49 to 34, to a motion by Sen. Mansfield to proceed to consideration of the bill. pp. 7768-9, 7769-72, 7777-80
Sen. Mundt (for himself and Sens. Hruska, Case, S. Dak., Allott, and Curtis), submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to this bill, H. R. 10788. p. 7728
3. FARM PROGRAM. Sen. Hart submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to S. 3225, the farm bill, to amend the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 so as to permit the use of funds collected through marketing orders to be used to promote advertising and sales programs for cherries. pp. 7727-8
4. WATERSHEDS. The Special Subcommittee on Watershed Projects of the Agriculture Committee approved for full committee consideration the following watershed projects: Napa River, Calif.; Indian Wash, Colo.; Rocky Comfort Creek, Ga.; South Fork of Black Water River, Mo.; and Mulberry Creek, Tenn. p. D367
Both Houses received from the Budget Bureau plans for works of improvement on the following watersheds: Puukapu watershed, Hawaii, Scattering Fork watershed, Ill., and Little Kentucky River, Ky. (to Agriculture and Forestry Committee); Hurricane Creek, Ala., Marbury Creek and Middle Fork Broad River, Ga., and North Sanpete watershed, Utah (to Public Works Committee). pp. 7726, 7817
Received from this Department a watershed work plan for the North Sanpete watershed, Utah; to Public Works Committee. p. 7726
5. PUBLIC WORKS. Sen. Capehart stated that in proposing to have S. 2965, the standby public works acceleration bill, referred to the Banking and Currency Committee for study he did not intend "to impose an unnecessary delay in the Senate's consideration of that portion of the bill which the administration feels is needed for immediate relief of the serious unemployment problem." p. 7736
6. DISASTER RELIEF. Both Houses received from the President a report on disaster relief activities (H. Doc. 405). pp. 7725, 7791
7. OLDER PERSONS AID. Both Houses received from the President a proposed bill "to provide assistance for research or training projects leading to development of new or improved programs to help older persons"; to H. Education and Labor and S. Labor and Public Welfare Committees. pp. 7726, 7817
8. SMALL BUSINESS. Received from the Select Committee on Small Business its annual report (S. Rept. 1491). p. 7726
9. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Sen. Mansfield announced that the calendar will be called this Thurs. He stated that it was the intention of the leadership to call up next Mon., May 21, the farm bill, to be followed by the public works acceleration bill and the Interior and related agencies appropriation bill. p. 7769

can make progress. It is tremendously heartening to have the Senator on our side.

I hope that Members, having endured what we have on the cloture votes, may see the wisdom of continuing this fight. I hope Senators will remember the action on the tabling motion and will vote to maintain the issue before the Senate, so that we may do our utmost to do our duty by it, since it would deal with at least one of the crying national needs in this field.

I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I am grateful to the able senior Senator from New York for what he has said. I am grateful also for the leadership he has supplied in this Chamber and outside of it in the fight which has been made.

The comment the Senator makes with respect to the almost identical similarity of the issue now before the Senate, as compared to the tabling motion of several days ago, is a pungent and powerful one. A clear and convincing majority of U.S. Senators indicated what they believe with respect to the merits of this issue when that problem came before the Senate with respect to the tabling motion.

The Senator from New York is precisely correct. We face the same issue. We can ask Senators to search their own consciences, knowing the basis upon which they cast their votes only a few days ago, and to demonstrate once again their vigor and solidarity, by taking the same position when the roll is called.

I thank my friend very much.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield to the able junior Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from California again has spoken, as he always does on all issues, out of a depth of sincere conviction. We who serve with him know of his great leadership, not only as one of the titular leaders of our party in the Senate but also as a leader of conviction in those causes to which he has committed himself.

The strengthening of the civil rights of our citizens, the bettering of human rights, is a matter very close and dear to the Senator's heart. I know of no one in my experience who has worked harder to bring about a betterment of the lot of our citizens than our distinguished friend from California.

Earlier in the day—and we are nearly up to the point of voting now—I appealed to another group in this Chamber. I appealed to the group who voted against cloture, against “gagging” the minority, as it was put. Now the effort is made to “gag” the majority. That will be the effect of a vote to consider another bill. It will be a vote to say “The majority shall not have an opportunity to set forth its views on this issue. They shall not have an opportunity to offer their amendments.” The distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] will be “gagged.” The distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] will be “gagged.” Those of the rest of us who wish to pass something other than the par-

ticular literacy test bill in this field will not be given the opportunity to do so. That is what a vote for the motion will be.

The issues could not have been more effectively summed up than they have been by the stalwart defender of civil rights who has addressed the Senate, the distinguished Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. I express my thanks to my friend the very able junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], and I thank him profusely for his kind comments.

The Senator speaks the truth when he calls to the attention of the Senate the fact that the vote to shear away abruptly the question to which we have devoted ourselves for several weeks will very effectively put a clamp on those Senators in this Chamber who desire to offer amendments to the proposed legislation in an effort to perfect it in accordance with their views.

That, too, is a right which ought not be denied to a majority of those who, as the Senator says, feel that in the last analysis the Senate has a responsibility to legislate constructively in this field.

I thank the Senator again.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall speak very briefly on the pending question. I have spoken once before during the debate, and I hope I made it clear for the Record what my position is on the principle of the issue before the Senate.

I wish to associate myself with the position taken by the Senators from New York [Mr. JAVITS and Mr. KEATING], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], and other Senators who have taken the position that we ought to get the voting issue behind us once and for all.

There are Senators who sincerely and honestly believe that the pending proposal is unconstitutional. If they so believe, they should take the position which they have taken and make clear, as they have made clear, that they propose to vote against the measure because they consider it to be unconstitutional. I respectfully disagree with the legal conclusion that they have reached in regard to the proposed legislation. I am satisfied that under both the 14th amendment and the 15th amendment to the Constitution, as I said in my previous speech, the Congress is authorized to legislate on the subject. The provision of the 14th amendment is that—

The Congress shall have the power to enforce by appropriate legislation the provision of this article.

The provision of section 2 of the 15th amendment is that—

Congress shall have the power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

Those provisions place the proposed legislation before us squarely within the jurisdiction of the Congress, leaving the question as to whether or not the legislation proposed is appropriate so far as its constitutionality is concerned. I am satisfied that it is. Each Senator must

reach his own conclusion with regard to that question. If the proposed legislation is then passed, it will make its way through the judicial process to ultimate disposition by the U.S. Supreme Court.

As I see it, the responsibility of the Senate is to dispose of the issue once and for all.

As I said in my previous speech—and I shall not take time to read it again—the bill that I introduced would provide for no qualifications whatsoever, by way of literacy or any other test, provided that there is mental normality, which would be preferable legislation to the legislation that we are considering.

But I am a realist in the legislative process. I am aware of the fact that the legislation that I have proposed does not have any chance now until there is greater understanding as to its soundness throughout the country. I only file the caveat today that we shall continue to press for that type of legislation so long as I serve in the Senate. But in the meantime, I take the position that we are not justified in imposing a literacy test, a property test, or any other test on the right to vote of a person in this country who is a citizen and has a normal mentality.

If we have illiterate people, that is our fault. We ought to do something to take that blotch off of our record. But so long as they are citizens and have normal intelligence, they should have the right to vote. I do not know how many have such ancestors, but a considerable number of mine would not be allowed to vote in States having literacy tests. Yet I would not trade their political sagacity and judgment for the judgment of a great many Phi Beta Kappas I know when it comes to passing on the question as to whether a candidate for office is the best qualified among the candidates to serve in a given office.

We cannot come to grips with that particular issue in the controversy before us.

I wish to say a few words before I close with regard to the legislative issue before the Senate, as I see it. In doing so, I wish to bear out the position taken by those I mentioned a few minutes ago, including the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], and others who have pressed in this historical debate the proposal that now is the time to dispose of the question with finality on its merits so far as the legislative process is concerned.

The majority leader knows the love and affection in which I hold him, and my position on the question is entirely impersonal so far as my majority leader is concerned. He knows that I have not shared the point of view of the majority heretofore, at least—which probably the present vote will sustain—that if we could not break the filibuster that has been conducted by a cloture motion and a vote thereon, then we should lay the business aside and proceed with other business of the Senate.

I do not think we shall ever break filibusters on any issue of great concern to

a strong minority in the Senate if we follow that procedure. I am not one who believes that we shall break filibusters in my time by a change in rule XXII. I would like to be that kind of optimist, but I do not think we shall change rule XXII next year or the year after. We shall try, and I shall always be in there fighting for the change.

We shall really end the filibuster in the Senate when the Senate proceeds to do the things that are necessary in order to secure the support of the American people. The American people do not understand the procedure. The American people do not understand what happens procedurally in the Senate. The American people do not understand that, after all, the Senate procedurally can be victimized by an effective, able, and powerful minority any time that minority wishes to go to work on the legislative process.

In retaliation we can follow the procedure that we have followed in the present instance. Of course, it will be costly. There is no question about the fact that for a time some proposed legislation will be held up. But the protection of the democratic process is worth the price, no matter what we must pay for it. We shall break the filibuster and drive the technique of the filibuster off the floor of the Senate when it becomes known that a majority of the Senate is as willful as the minority. When it becomes known that a majority will not take it but will fight back, and call upon the American people to understand the procedural problem that confronts us in the Senate in respect to the filibuster technique, though it may take 2 weeks or 2 months to break the filibuster, we can do so. In my judgment, we would only kid ourselves if we should think that we can continually postpone decision on the question, always holding out the carrot that at the next session of Congress we will modify rule XXII.

I have been in the Senate for 17 years. I have heard the statement about amending the rule every year for 17 years. Should I be privileged to remain here longer after November 1962—and they are going to have to beat me first before the decision is made that I will not remain here longer—I expect to hear it year after year thereafter until the Senate, or a majority thereof, says, "We have had our belly full—so full that we are nauseated. Better get rid of it."

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this time?

Mr. MORSE. Yes, I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. First, I express my pleasure in being associated with the distinguished Senator from Oregon in respect of his views relating to a change of rule XXII.

More than that, I should like to express my agreement with the Senator that a determined majority could do what must be done in the Senate Chamber over a long enough period of time. I believe that a change in the rule is indicated. A determined majority does not have to employ all the weapons which it would have to employ in advance of a change in a rule, but as the distinguished from Illinois [Mr. Douglas] has said, any change in a rule depends upon a determined majority. We

shall not get anywhere in January in such an attempt without a determined majority.

I should like to join the distinguished Senator from Oregon, whose voice is so important in the country, in telling the American people that nothing will happen with respect to measures of the kind before the Senate without a determined majority that the people have called to account.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from New York. I have made my case. There is nothing more I can say, except that we have invested 2 weeks of precious time on this issue, time belonging to all the taxpayers of the United States. We ought to make up our determined mind that we will see this thing through.

If there are those who want to start a filibuster all over, let them start it. Give the American people 2 weeks of 24-hour sessions, day and night, and focus their attention on the Senate of the United States, and no one will need worry as to what the final outcome will be. The American people will break the filibuster; we will not. Sooner or later, Mr. President, we will have to cross that bridge. I think now is the time to start the journey across the bridge. Therefore I shall vote against the proposal pending before the Senate, because I think that what we ought to do is continue to debate this matter for as many days and weeks and months as necessary, so that 1962 will go down in the annals of American history as the year in which a determined majority, as the Senator from New York has referred to it, demonstrated that it made up its mind to put the technique of the filibuster in the Senate behind it once and for all. There is no better time than now.

I suggest that we proceed now to do what I think is our clear job and responsibility in respect to the pending legislation before the Senate. Let us stay on the job until we either vote it up or down on its merits.

AMENDMENT TO AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10788) to amend section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask for a vote on the pending motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] to proceed to the consideration of H.R. 10788. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ENGLE (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. HARTKE (when his name was called). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS]. If he were present and voting, he would

vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

Mr. ANDERSON (after having voted in the negative). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], and the Senators from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER and Mr. MILLER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] is necessarily absent to be in his State for the primary elections.

On this vote, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT]. If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa would vote "yea," and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] is paired with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH]. If present and voting, the Senator from Maryland would vote "yea," and the Senator from Connecticut would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 49, nays 34, as follows:

[No. 52 Leg.]

YEAS—49

| | | |
|--------------|-----------|----------------|
| Aiken | Hill | Pell |
| Bennett | Holland | Prouty |
| Bible | Hruska | Robertson |
| Boggs | Jackson | Russell |
| Byrd, Va. | Jordan | Saltonstall |
| Byrd, W. Va. | Kerr | Smith, Maine |
| Carlson | Long, La. | Sparkman |
| Cotton | Mansfield | Stennis |
| Curtis | McClellan | Talmadge |
| Dworshak | McGee | Thurmond |
| Ellender | Metcalf | Tower |
| Ervin | Monroney | Wiley |
| Fong | Moss | Williams, Del. |
| Goldwater | Murphy | Yarborough |
| Gruening | Neuberger | Young, N. Dak. |
| Hayden | Pastore | |
| Hickey | Pearson | |

NAYS—34

| | | |
|---------------|--------------|----------------|
| Allott | Dodd | McNamara |
| Bartlett | Douglas | Morse |
| Beall | Hart | Morton |
| Burdick | Humphrey | Mundt |
| Cannon | Javits | Muskie |
| Capehart | Keating | Proxmire |
| Carroll | Kefauver | Smith, Mass. |
| Case, N.J. | Kuchel | Symington |
| Case, S. Dak. | Lausche | Williams, N.J. |
| Clark | Long, Mo. | Young, Ohio |
| Cooper | Long, Hawaii | |
| Dirksen | McCarthy | |

NOT VOTING—17

| | | |
|----------|--------------|----------|
| Anderson | Engle | Magnuson |
| Bush | Fulbright | Miller |
| Butler | Gore | Randolph |
| Chavez | Hartke | Scott |
| Church | Hickenlooper | Smathers |
| Eastland | Johnston | |

So the motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 10788) to amend section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], I ask that he be granted official leave of absence tomorrow, to attend armed services functions in his State of Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, leave of absence is granted.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask leave of absence, so that I may be absent on Thursday and Friday of this week, to attend to some matters of consequence in Oregon.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am sure the Senate will grant that request, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, leave of absence is granted.

AMENDMENT OF THE AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10788) to amend section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is Calendar No. 1304, House bill 10788, to amend section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956.

The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER obtained the floor.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield briefly to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. For the information of the Senate, let me state what, so far as the leadership can determine, will be the calendar for the remainder of this week and for next week.

It is anticipated that on Thursday there will be a call of the Legislative Calendar, beginning with Calendar No. 1284, Senate bill 2801, to amend the Merchant Marine Act of 1936.

Other measures to be considered after the Thursday calendar call will be the Calendar No. 1305, House bill 7477, relating to the submission of a report on eligible public building projects; Calendar No. 1308, House bill 8916, to authorize grants for expansion and improvement of the facilities of George Washington University Hospital, in the District of Columbia; Calendar No. 1451, House bill 11261, to authorize an adequate White House Police force—in the event that these measures are not passed during the call of the Legislative Calendar.

It may be that, if there is sufficient time, certain measures on the calendar

may be called upon tomorrow afternoon.

It is the intention of the leadership to call up on Monday the farm bill, Calendar No. 1333, Senate bill 3225; and, after that, the public works acceleration bill, Calendar No. 1321, Senate bill 2965; Calendar No. 1314, House bill 7752, to amend the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act; and Calendar No. 1450, House bill 10802, making appropriations for the Department of the Interior.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President—
Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I merely wish to ask both the majority leader and the distinguished Senator from Louisiana whether the Senator from Louisiana expects to make a short preliminary statement on the text of House bill 10788.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; I plan to make a very short statement.

Mr. DIRKSEN. And the debate on the bill will continue tomorrow?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is my understanding.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I believe the Senator from Nebraska contemplates that there will be debate on the bill tonight; but it will not be finished tonight, and will continue tomorrow.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. I hope that the consideration of this measure can be expedited, for I do not think there is much controversy about it. I understand that a point will be made by some Senators who are interested in cattle. However, the bill is strictly a textile measure, and I do not see why we cannot complete our action on it tonight.

Mr. MUNDT. Let me say, as the author of one amendment—I do not know how many amendments there are—that I think there will be considerable debate, and it would involve a rather late session tonight.

Mr. HRUSKA. Certainly the debate will require more than several hours.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it seems likely that the consideration of the pending business will take some time. Therefore, I anticipate that no votes will be taken tonight, but that votes will be taken tomorrow.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its session tonight, it adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR CALL OF THE CALENDAR ON THURSDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that on Thurs-

day next, at the conclusion of the morning hour, the Legislative Calendar be called, beginning with Calendar No. 1284, Senate bill 2801, to amend the Merchant Marine Act of 1936.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator from Louisiana for his courtesy in yielding.

AMENDMENT OF THE AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10788) to amend section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956.

Mr. ELLENDER. Madam President, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry considered the bill and reported it, without any objection, on April 12.

The bill is very simple. At first, some objection was made to the bill, until the committee was able to determine whether timber produces should be considered agricultural products.

At this point I wish to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to me, dated April 4, from the Department of Agriculture, in which there is a statement on this question. The conclusion reached is set forth in the last paragraph of the letter, which states in part that—

It is, therefore, our opinion that forestry is a part of agriculture and that timber is an agricultural commodity.

The letter is signed by John G. Bagwell, General Counsel of the Department of Agriculture.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have that letter; a letter of March 21, addressed to me, from the Department of Labor; and a letter, addressed to the Vice President, dated March 9, and signed by the Under Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Edward Gude- man, printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C., March 9, 1962.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Department of Commerce urges the introduction and enactment of the enclosed draft legislation to amend section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956.

Section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 authorized the President to negotiate international agreements relating to the export to and the import by the United States of "any agricultural commodity or product manufactured therefrom or textiles or textile products." Because it was drafted primarily with bilateral agreements in mind, the existence of necessary power in the President with respect to nonparticipants in a broadly based multilateral agreement is questionable. In both the 1-year cotton textiles arrangement presently in force and the long-term cotton textiles arrangement, expected to come into force with substantially the same participants on October 1, 1962, provisions permit the United States to take action to prevent trade with nonparticipants in the arrangements from frustrating the purposes of the arrangements. Since countries accounting for 90 percent of the free world trade in cotton textiles are participants, the same authority which the President has already been delegated by section

204 should clearly be extended to nonparticipants to prevent the minority of countries which choose to stay out of the arrangements from thereby gaining an advantage over the countries which participate in them.

By the term "significant" in the draft is meant significant to the national interest of the United States. The term "products" is intended to convey the concept of origin; that is, "products of countries" means articles which are the growth, manufacture, or produce of those countries.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that, from the standpoint of the administration's program, there is no objection to the presentation of this legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD GUDEMAN,
Under Secretary of Commerce.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, March 21, 1962.

HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry,
U. S. Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR ELLENDER: I am taking this opportunity to set forth the Department of Labor's position on S. 3006, a bill recently referred to your committee which would amend section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956.

As you know, section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 authorizes the President to carry on the negotiation of international agreements limiting the importation into the United States of agricultural commodities including textiles and textile products. Since section 204 was apparently principally intended to enable the President to negotiate on a bilateral basis with respect to these commodities, there is some question as to whether the President can apply similar limits to nonparticipants where broad multilateral agreements are entered into.

The 1-year cotton textiles arrangement presently in force, and also the long-term cotton textiles arrangement expected to come into force on October 1, 1962, have substantially the same participating countries. These arrangements contain provisions permitting the United States to act to prevent trade with nonparticipants from frustrating the design and purpose of the arrangements. Since approximately 90 percent of the free trade in cotton textiles is carried on by the countries participating in these arrangements, we believe that the same authority which the President has under section 204 with respect to participants should be extended to nonparticipants. Such authority would prevent the minority of countries which choose to stay out of arrangements from thus gaining an advantage over participating countries. S. 3006 would vest such authority in the President.

The necessity for resolving the question which presently exists is of obvious importance to the Department of Labor. Particularly, it should be noted that the Interagency Textile Administrative Committee on which this Department is represented has studied the terms of S. 3006, and has recommended its enactment. Accordingly, I urge favorable action on this proposal.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that it has no objection to the presentation of this report from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Yours sincerely,

ARTHUR GOLDBERG,
Secretary of Labor.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL,
Washington, D. C., April 4, 1962.

HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

DEAR SENATOR ELLENDER: Mr. Stanton, counsel for your committee, has informed us

that in considering S. 3006, to amend section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 (7 U.S.C. 1854), the question has been raised as to whether the phrase "any agricultural commodity or product manufactured therefrom" includes timber and its products.

Section 204 is as follows:

"The President may, whenever he determines such action appropriate, negotiate with representatives of foreign governments in an effort to obtain agreements limiting the export from such countries and the importation into the United States of any agricultural commodity or product manufactured therefrom or textiles or textile products, and the President is authorized to issue regulations governing the entry or withdrawal from warehouse of any such commodity, product, textiles, or textile products to carry out any such agreement. Nothing herein shall affect the authority provided under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act (of 1933) as amended (7 U.S.C. 1854)."

Although we have not had time to examine the legislative history of this provision exhaustively, our study thus far indicates that such history does not give clear evidence of the intention of the Congress in this respect. In examining this question, therefore, we believe we must first determine the meaning of this phrase as the words therein have been generally construed.

Webster's New International Dictionary, 2d edition, defines agriculture as "The art or science of cultivating the ground, and raising and harvesting crops, often including also feeding, breeding and management of livestock; tillage; husbandry; farming; in a broader sense, the science and art of the production of plants and animals useful to man, including to a variable extent the preparation of these products for man's use and their disposal by marketing or otherwise. In the broad use it includes farming, horticulture, forestry, dairying, sugar making, etc." (Emphasis supplied.)

Court decisions have adopted the foregoing definition of "agriculture" in defining agricultural commodities and products. *United States v. Turner Turpentine Co.* (111 F. 2d 400 (5th Cir. 1940)) involved the issue of whether labor performed in the production of gum from oleoresin by scarification of living pine trees and its processing into gum spirits of turpentine and gum resin was "agricultural labor" as used in the Social Security Act. The Social Security Act of 1935, as it read before the 1939 amendments, was the law before the court in this case and the term "agricultural labor" was not defined. In holding that Congress intended the term to have a comprehensive meaning so as to include tree products, the court said at page 404:

"When then, Congress in passing an act like the Social Security Act uses, in laying down a broad general policy of exclusion, a term as general import as 'agricultural labor,' it must be considered that it used the term in a sense and intended it to have a meaning wide enough and broad enough to cover and embrace agricultural labor of any and every kind, as that term is understood in the various sections of the United States where the act operates. This does not mean, of course, that a mere local custom, which is in the face of the meaning of a general term used in an act, may be read into the act to vary its terms. It does mean, however, that when a word or term intended to have general application in an activity as broad as agriculture, has a wide meaning, it must be interpreted broadly enough to embrace in it all the kinds and forms of agriculture practiced where it operates, that its generality reasonably extends to. Definitions of 'agriculture' in standard texts and treatises and in decisions in these latter years have had the widest content. Funk & Wagnall defines 'agriculture' as including horticulture, fruit raising, etc., 'because ag-

riculture is the science that treats of the cultivation of the soil.' Webster's Unabridged Dictionary, 1935, declares that in a broader sense agriculture includes farming, horticulture, forestry, dairying, sugarmaking, etc. The Encyclopedia Britannica, 14th edition, 'Forestry as a Science,' declares: 'the science underlying the growing of timber crops is therefore nothing but a branch of general plant science,' while the Cyclopaedia of American Agriculture says of forests, 'if agriculture is the raising of products from the land, then forestry is a part of agriculture' (vol. 2, p. 312). From the Encyclopedia Britannica article, on rosin production, we quote the following significant passage: 'The chief region of rosin production is the South Atlantic and Eastern Gulf States of the United States. American rosin is obtained from the turpentine of the swamp pine and of the loblolly pine. The main source of supply in Europe is the lands of the departments of Gironde and Landes in France, where the cluster pine is extensively cultivated.' An examination of the cases cited in 'Words and Phrases,' fifth series, volume 1, page 339 et seq., under agriculture and in 3 C.J.S., 'Agriculture,' pages 361, 365, and 366, section 1, under 'agricultural' and 'agriculture,' convinces that in modern usage this is a wide and comprehensive term and that statutes using it without qualification must be given an equally comprehensive meaning."

The Turner Turpentine Co. case was followed in *Stuart v. Kleck* (129 F. 2d 400 (9th Cir. 1942)), which also involved the definition of "agricultural labor" as used in the Social Security Act. In the following cases the courts adopted definitions of "products of the land," "agriculture," "agricultural purposes," "agricultural commodities," "agricultural products," or "agricultural labor," some as used in statutes, in the broad sense of things which are the result of husbandry and the cultivation of the soil (*Sancho v. Bowie*, 93 F. 2d 323 (1st Cir. 1937); *Lowe v. North Dakota Workman's Compensation Bureau*, 220 Wis. 701, 264 N.W. 837 (1936); *Forsythe v. Village of Cooksville*, 356 Ill. 289, 190 N.E. 421 (1934); *In Re Rogers*, 134 Neb. 832, 279 N.W. 800 (1938); *Getty v. C. R. Barnes Milling Co.*, 40 Kan. 281, 19 Pac. 617 (1888); *Florida Industrial Comm'n v. Growers Equipment Co.*, 152 Fla. 595, 12 So. 2d 889 (1943)).

Congress has recognized that the term "agricultural commodities" may include forest products. Section 207 of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 1091; 7 U.S.C. 1626) defines "agricultural products" to include "agricultural, horticultural, viticultural, and dairy products, livestock and poultry, bees, forest products, fish and shellfish, and any products thereof, including processed and manufactured products, and any and all products raised or produced on farms and any processed and manufactured products thereof."

Section 518 of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (55 Stat. 256; as amended, 7 U.S.C. 1518), defines "agricultural commodity" as "wheat, cotton, flax, corn, dry beans, oats, barley, rye, tobacco, rice, peanuts, soybeans, sugarbeets, sugarcane, timber and forests, potatoes and other vegetables, citrus and other fruits, tame hay."

Section 2 of the act of May 9, 1956 (70 Stat. 133; 12 U.S.C. 1841(g)), concerning bank holding companies, defines "agriculture" to include "farming in all its branches including fruitgrowing, dairying, the raising of livestock, bees, fur-bearing animals, or poultry, forestry or lumbering operations, and the production of naval stores, and operations directly related thereto."

Section 1 of the act of March 4, 1927 (44 Stat. 1423; as amended, 15 U.S.C. 431), concerning discrimination against farmers' cooperative associations by boards of trade, states that "agricultural products" "means

agricultural, horticultural, viticultural, and dairy products, food products of livestock, the products of poultry and bee raising, the edible products of forestry, and any and all products raised or produced on farms and processed or manufactured products thereof, transported or intended to be transported in interstate and/or foreign commerce."

Section 3 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (52 Stat. 1060; as amended, 29 U.S.C. 203(f)), defines "agriculture" to include farming in all its branches and among other things includes the cultivation and tillage of the soil, dairying, the production, cultivation, growing, and harvesting of any agricultural or horticultural commodities (including commodities defined as agricultural commodities in section 1141j(g) of title 12), the raising of livestock, bees, fur-bearing animals, or poultry, and any practices (including any forestry or lumbering operations) performed by a farmer or on a farm as an incident to or in conjunction with such farming operations, including preparation for market, delivery to storage or to market or to carriers for transportation to market."

The present social security tax law, now known as the Federal Unemployment Tax Act, has an extensive definition of "agricultural labor," which includes expressly only some forest products such as naval stores (68A Stat. 447; 26 U.S.C. 3306(k)).

As may be seen, some of the definitions, for the immediate purposes involved in the legislation, include forestry products only in part. However, we believe even in these instances, this serves as an indication that where the terms "agricultural commodities" or "products thereof" are used without qualification it is reasonable to include timber in the concept.

We believe that in the historical development of public attention to the timber resources of this Nation the concept has long been that the growing of trees and the work of forestation and reforestation is a part of agriculture. It also appears to be a necessary corollary that timber is an agricultural commodity and that lumber is a product of such commodity. We have found a number of instances both past and present where this concept is expressed. We will quote a few of these.

In an annual report of the Secretary of the Interior (Ethan Allen Hitchcock) in 1901 the following is stated:¹

"The keynote of the administration of the forest reserves should be to increase the value of the reserves to the public and to perpetuate their forests by wise use * * *. Forestry, dealing as it does with a source of wealth produced by the soil, is properly an agricultural subject."

Gifford Pinchot, Chief of the Bureau of Forestry in the Department of Agriculture in 1902, in a statement before the Agricultural Committee of the House, declared:

"Forestry is a component part of agriculture. Every source of wealth grown from the soil is in the sphere of the Department of Agriculture; hence the forest work rightly belongs to it. The production of timber is as naturally within the scope of the Department of Agriculture as is the production of field crops."

Secretary of Agriculture D. F. Houston, in a letter to the chairman of the Public Lands Committee of the Senate, June 24, 1918, stated:

"This Department is charged with the task of stimulating and improving the production of all forms of wealth grown from the soil. A forest is a crop, and forestry is primarily a problem of production from the soil."

¹ Some of the following quotations have been derived from a collected document which is authentic. Time has not permitted review of the original sources.

Secretary of Agriculture E. T. Meredith, in an annual report to the President dated November 15, 1921, stated:

"The Bureau of Crop Estimates secures information on the needs of stockmen and farmers for public and national forest ranges which aids the national forest administration, and collects also data on the products of farm woodlots which is of value in the development of farm forestry. In short, having largely exhausted the forest crop grown in advance; the problem now is to use more widely what remains and to grow other crops to meet our needs. That is to say, forestry is a distinctly agricultural business. The function of the Department as a whole includes efforts for the production of the most effective manufacture, distribution, and utilization of the products of both farm and forest for the benefit of the country at large."

President Franklin D. Roosevelt in a letter to the Joint Committee on Forestry of the Congress declared:²

"Forests are intimately tied into our whole social and economic life. They grow on more than one-third the land area of the continental United States. Wages from forest industries support 5 to 6 million people each year. Forests give us building materials and thousands of other things in everyday use. Forest lands furnish food and shelter for much of our remaining game, and healthful recreation for millions of our people. Forests help prevent erosion and floods. They conserve water and regulate its use for navigation for power, for domestic use, and for irrigation. Woodlands occupy more acreage than any other crop on American farms, and help support 2½ million families.

"Our forest problem is essentially one of land use. It is a part of the broad problem of modern agriculture that is common to every part of the country. Forest lands total some 615 million acres."

In testifying in 1951 on S. 1149, a bill to reorganize the Department of Agriculture, Lyle F. Watts, Chief of the Forest Service, stated:³

"Forestry and grazing are agricultural functions: Trees and grass are crops. Like corn, wheat, and cotton they start from seed. They respond to the same kind of care given other crops. They are harvested—or at least they should be harvested—so that one crop follows another. Their culture is based on the biological sciences, which are chiefly and in many cases exclusively the concern of the Department of Agriculture. Insect and plant-disease control, genetics, soil science, and other agricultural sciences are as important to growing crops of trees and grass as they are to field crops.

"Forestry and grazing are inseparable parts of agriculture. It takes the same know-how to grow timber in the farmer's woods as it does in forests owned by anyone else. Farm woodlands are indispensable to the Nation's timber supply. Farmers own one-third of all our commercial forest land—139 million acres.

"Turning it around, woodlands are indispensable to the farmer. Forest lands make up half the total farm acreage in New England and about 40 percent of all farm acreage in the South. Forest products provide farmers in many regions with a valuable source of cash income. When forest land is properly managed, the timber harvest can be as regular and dependable as any other crop.

"Farm forestry is an integral part of the Department's farm program. Farmers look to the Department of Agriculture for help

² Mar. 14, 1938, report of the Joint Committee on Forestry, S. Doc. No. 32, 77th Cong., 1st sess.

³ Hearings before the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, U.S. Senate, 82d Cong., 1st sess., p. 442.

on farm forestry just as they do in animal husbandry, fruitgrowing, or other crop problems. The small nonfarm forest properties of 125 million acres, almost as extensive as the farm forests and often intermingled with them, face exactly the same problems and should be served by the same agency.

"Nor can any sharp line be drawn between forestry and grazing. In much of the South and West the same land is used to grow both trees and grass. Thus all such lands are interrelated parts of the Nation's agricultural enterprise.

"And from the watershed angle, forest and grazing lands are inseparably linked with field-crop lands. In every watershed, we must have a unified approach covering all lands to effectively control erosion, floods, and water supply. Soil conservation and watershed management are agriculture, and the Department of Agriculture, under the Flood Control Act of 1936, is responsible for watershed surveys on all lands. Within the Department, the Forest Service and the Soil Conservation Service work together closely to reduce damage from floods and sedimentation on forest, grazing, and other crop lands.

"Adding it all up, any way you look at it, the answer is the same: Forestry and grazing are agriculture."

It is, therefore, our opinion that forestry is a part of agriculture and that timber is an agricultural commodity. It follows therefore, that the products thereof, such as lumber, are products within the definition in section 204. We have attempted to analyze the problem from the standpoint of general precedent and authority. If the foregoing analysis is not consistent with the present intent and purposes of the Congress, you may wish to reexamine the question for greater clarification.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN C. BAGWELL,
General Counsel.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as I stated, this is a very simple bill. It authorizes the President, for the purpose of carrying out any agreement under section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956, to limit the importation of any agricultural commodity or product covered by such agreement from countries not participating in the agreement. It would be applicable only in the case of agreements where imports from participating countries account for a significant part of the world trade in the article.

Mr. PASTORE. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I will yield in just a few moments. I would prefer to complete my short statement at this time.

Section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 authorizes the President to enter into agreements with foreign countries limiting the importation of any agricultural commodity or product thereof. He does not have clear authority at present to limit imports from countries not participating in the agreement, and this bill would provide such authority. At present the only agreement in force under section 204 is the 1-year cotton textile arrangement in which 19 countries participate. Passage of the bill is urgently needed to prevent anticipated imports from nonparticipating countries vitiating the effect of the agreement.

That is all the bill provides. It is that simple.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. My section of the country is heartily in favor of the bill, from the textile point of view.

Mr. ELLENDER. I was sure it would be.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. What the bill means is that the President, through unilateral action, can make the agreement with 19 countries effective. If this measure does not go through, the multilateral agreement becomes ineffective. Is that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; ineffective because the countries not participating in the agreement could send in their products.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. This measure is an extension of the present law. Is that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. No; it is not an extension. It is a clarification of it. Under the law as it stands, it is doubtful whether the President has authority to limit imports from countries not participating in the agreement. This measure gives him that authority.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. This measure gives him that authority, and it goes on indefinitely.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. JAVITS. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I am sympathetic to the 19-nation agreement, though I am favorable to the liberalization of our trade policy. Was there any testimony before the committee as to the effect, in terms of trade relations, of this bill upon countries which would be affected by it and which, I assume, are not parties to the 19-country agreement?

Mr. ELLENDER. No; there were no hearings on that point.

Mr. JAVITS. Does the State Department give any opinion on it?

Mr. ELLENDER. It did in the hearings held before the Committee on Agriculture of the House. I understand the State Department is favorable to the bill. In fact, all the departments of the Government are in favor of it. The Labor Department and the Agriculture Department are in favor of it, as well as the State Department.

Mr. JAVITS. As well as the Commerce Department?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. As a matter of fact, the entire proposal was initiated by the Commerce Department, because of this lack of authority to bind countries that are not parties to the agreement.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. To comment on what the Senator from New York has said, am I correct in saying that 90 percent of the textile imports come within the multilateral agreement, so that only 10 percent of the imports would affect the 19 countries that are a part of the agreement?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is my understanding.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

SENATE RULES OF PROCEDURE

Mr. CLARK. Madam President—

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. Madam President, a few moments ago the Senate, by rollcall vote, completed the fourth of four extraordinary actions involving the subjects of literacy tests, civil rights, the Senate rules, and the filibuster.

I should like for a few minutes this afternoon to analyze, first, what happened; second, why it happened; third, the results in the country, and on the Senate itself, of the action which the Senate took; and, finally, to suggest again the necessity for changing the rules of the Senate.

Some persons may say this talk is in the nature of a funeral oration. Perhaps it is, for it certainly marks the demise of any hope of significant civil rights legislation at this session of the Congress. But I think it is important that we should seriously consider in this body what we have just done and give consideration to whether what we did was wise or proper; and, further, look into our own hearts to see whether we in this body are not operating under a great delusion—a delusion that we are not a part of the world today, a delusion that in this air-conditioned chamber, filled with genial friends, we can, in a sense, let the rest of the world go by while we continue to operate under procedures which were obsolete before the end of the 19th century.

Mr. JAVITS. Madam President, will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield.

Mr. JAVITS. First, I appreciate the Senator's making this statement for our "team" after the vote. This is very sound procedure, since the Senator now has the whole picture in front of him. I am delighted that he is doing so.

Second, I wish to add that not only is the Senate operating under a delusion that we can pursue these archaic procedures, to which the Senator so properly has referred, but to remind the Senate that it is operating under a delusion that the problem will not be here if we do not do anything about enacting legislation, that the Negroes will be very happy about the fact that they are disfranchised, that they will stop "sitting in," stop protesting about doing nothing about it, and that they will settle down to things as they were in pre-Civil War days.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is, eminently correct. We as an institution seem to think that if we say, to borrow a Russian word, "Nyet," long enough and loud enough the problems we face can all be swept under the rug; that we can go home, go to bed, and forget about them.

I thank the Senator.

I turn now to a consideration of what happened. At the request of the Attorney General of the United States, the President asked the leadership to take up and attempt to pass a relatively minor civil rights bill, a bill which would have substituted, for existing provisions in the

laws of some eight Southern States which provide for literacy tests as a qualification for voting a Federal law providing that anyone who has a sixth-grade education shall not be subjected to any literacy test, but, insofar as that particular qualification is concerned, shall be entitled to vote.

The report of the Civil Rights Commission had made it abundantly clear that in 100 counties in 8 Southern States literacy tests were being abused so as to disfranchise citizens of the United States because of their race or color. The Attorney General was quite right, I think, in desiring that Congress should pass Federal legislation, as the President recommended, to overcome that defect.

This proposed legislation was clearly needed. I believe it to be clearly wise. As I have hitherto argued on the floor of the Senate, I think it is clearly constitutional.

It was obvious from the start, however, that our friends from the South were determined not to permit the proposed legislation to come to a vote. So a desultory debate was engaged in, which went on without much spirit, one way or another, for the larger part of 2 weeks.

The majority and minority leaders were together in sponsoring the proposed legislation and in keeping it before the Senate, so it was a bipartisan measure despite the fact that it was advocated by the President and by the Attorney General.

When I first came to the Senate in 1957, and again in 1960, there was a procedure attempted for dealing with filibusters which was quite different from the procedure in which we engaged this time. We then, as the saying is, used to "go around the clock." The Senate was kept in continuous session. Senators slept on cots or not at all.

We never broke a filibuster that way. The Senate did pass two rather limited civil rights bills, not because the filibuster was broken, but only because our friends from the South were confident that the bills would not result in much damage to their age-long position and were content, after awhile, to let them pass.

This time we used a different procedure, a somewhat more gentlemanly one. We came in late. We adjourned early. Everybody was relaxed.

We did not beat the filibuster that way, either. I do not think anybody seriously thought we could.

After the desultory debate had gone on for awhile, after most Senators who opposed the proposal had made speeches, and after many Senators who supported the bipartisan effort to pass the proposal had made speeches, to give their arguments, to make their position in support quite clear, the leadership moved for cloture under rule XXII.

As we all know, it takes a vote of two-thirds of the Senators present and voting to impose cloture or to limit debate. Last Wednesday the vote on the cloture motion came. The cloture motion was defeated by a vote of 53 to 43.

It is probably not of much significance, but perhaps it should be noted for the

Departments had between them five officers charged with maintaining a useful liaison with Congress. By the end of the war, there were 65. By 1960, the services, combined in the Department of Defense, had 500 or approximately one for each congressman. What all this costs the Defense Department has been, over the years, the Defense Department's secret. Not long ago, however, a State Department statistician estimated for a representative of the Chicago Daily News that the Pentagon spends roughly \$30 million a year on public information, which is 20 times as much as the State Department spends. The source, who added bitterly that Defense people make six times as many speeches on foreign policy as State Department people, was not the most objective in the world, but the figures seemed sound to most observers here. But if few figures exist on the number of military lobbyists, no one has the faintest idea how many representatives industry maintains. Since 1946, there has been on the books a Regulation of Lobbying Act, which requires professional pleaders to register with the Clerk of the House and the Secretary of the Senate and to file detailed financial statements. The law is a joke. It has been estimated that not 1 in 10 lobbyists registers. The financial statements of those who do are generally thought to be valueless. In any case, the really important lobbying done by industry is done not in Congress but in the Pentagon.

The defense contractors take their case to the military men, who, if they find it persuasive, take it to Congress. Very often, the industry men are former military men. A study made by the Investigations Subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee in 1959 turned up more than 1,400 retired officers of the rank of major or higher in the employ of a hundred leading defense contractors. Two hundred and sixty-one were generals or admirals. General Dynamics, which employed the largest number of retired officers (187, of whom 27 were generals or admirals), chanced to be awarded the largest defense orders of any firm in 1960. The head of General Dynamics at the time was Frank Pace, a former Secretary of the Army. As Vice Adm. Hyman Rickover, an astute observer of the ways things get done and don't get done in the military, has pointed out, there is very likely to be a tie that binds any retired officer to the men who move up in the service as a consequence of his retirement.

The 1959 investigation turned up a few instances of large-scale partygiving by defense contractors for procurement officers and Congressmen, and there is a tendency here to think that if a way could be found to isolate the military men and politicians from this sort of thing, the power of the military-industrial complex would be greatly lessened. There have been cases in which pressure has been used rather nakedly. Senator PROXMIER has cited one in which, during the summer of 1960, "the Pentagon succeeded in stopping cold a bill providing for Small Business Administration participation in Government procurement, although the bill had unanimously passed the Senate and was well on its way to passage in the House when the armed services intervened." It is doubtful, though, whether the road to the garrison state could be blocked even if a way could be found to eliminate all shady influences on procurement and on the making of budgets. In this connection, the case of Senator HENRY JACKSON, of Washington, is instructive.

Among those who consider themselves politically literate and au courant, it is fashionable to cock a knowing snook when Senator JACKSON's name comes up, and to impart the intelligence that he has been referred to as "the gentleman from Boeing," meaning that he has often been found extol-

ing the qualities of such Boeing products as the Air Force's Bomarc missile and the B-52 bomber. The implication is that Senator JACKSON is somehow or other tied to the Boeing management. This is pathetically—perhaps even tragically—wide of the mark. Senator JACKSON is probably as incorruptible as any Member of the 87th Congress. It is simply unthinkable that any amount of free entertainment provided by defense contractors would influence his judgment on a military question. It is just as unthinkable that he could be reached by any spurious argumentation advanced by Pentagon lobbyists. He is fully as wise to their ways as is Senator PROXMIER. Senator JACKSON, who is highly intelligent and as politically sophisticated as anyone in this city, is also, it so happens, a really first-class student and critic of military strategy. He is an Army Reserve officer with the rank of lieutenant colonel, and he has spent 8 years as a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee. He is, furthermore, a Democrat (he served as chairman of the Democratic National Committee during Mr. Kennedy's 1960 campaign for the Presidency) whose bent is leftward and whose support in the State of Washington comes not from business interests but from organized labor and from farmers. In his exceptional case, Senator JACKSON is undoubtedly persuaded of the merits of Boeing products and of Boeing's ability to do just about anything that is asked of it. If he should ever come to believe otherwise, however, he would find himself in a politically impossible situation. Boeing—which in 1961 was the third largest defense contractor in the country and had more than a billion dollars' worth of Government orders, or 4.8 percent of the total—is to Seattle and Washington as Du Pont is to Wilmington and Delaware.

The executives and the principal stockholders of Boeing might not find it too difficult to survive a prolonged decline in the company's fortunes, but such a decline would work enormous hardship not only on tens of thousands of workers but on all the tradesmen and service people whose income derives indirectly from this giant member of the military-industrial complex. It cannot, perhaps, be said that what is good for Boeing is good for America, but it can surely be said that what is bad for Boeing is bad for the State of Washington, a commonwealth for whose interests Senator JACKSON must speak here.

There are relatively few Members of Congress representing constituencies in whose lives a single Government contractor plays as large a part as the Boeing Co. plays in the lives of the citizens of Washington. There is probably, however, not one Congressman whose district does not have some major enterprise that is part of the military-industrial complex. According to a survey made by the Congressional Quarterly a little over a year ago, 282 of the 437 Members of the House of Representatives each has within his district at least one of the 738 installations of the armed services, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. The average is thus somewhat better than two and a half installations each, and even the lesser ones can be of such importance to a Congressman as to lead him to lose his bearings and speak of defense as though it were nothing but a prop for the local economy. Last year, Representative SAMUEL STRATTON, a Democrat from upstate New York, wired the Secretary of the Air Force, Eugene Zuckert, to express displeasure at reports of a plan to transfer certain operations from Griffiss Air Force Base, near Rome, N.Y., to some other place. "It is fantastic to learn," Mr. STRATTON's telegram said, "that one more defense department is considering recommendations which would have the effect of increasing unem-

ployment in upstate New York, already hard hit by layoffs." Senators JAVITS and KEATING, also of New York, have repeatedly protested the fact that California gets 23.7 percent of "military procurement actions" as against New York's 11.7.

In recent years, indeed, Congressmen have tended less and less to justify their military recommendations on the ground of effective national defense and have become rather charmingly candid in their view of defense as a pork barrel. "I am getting pretty hot under the collar," Representative KEN HECHLER, of West Virginia, told the House a couple of years ago, "about the way my State of West Virginia is shortchanged in Army, Navy, and Air Force installations." It was this sort of thing that frustrated the Eisenhower administration's repeated efforts to reduce National Guard and Army Reserve manpower to levels that would, as Mr. Eisenhower put it, "conform to the changing character and missions" of the regular services. In testimony before a subcommittee of the Joint Economic Committee early in 1960, Representative JAMIE L. WHITTEN, of Mississippi, said:

"I am convinced defense is only one of the factors that enter into our determinations for defense spending. The others are pump-priming, spreading the immediate benefits of defense spending, taking care of all services, giving all defense contractors a fair share, spreading the military bases to include all sections, et cetera. There is no State in the Union, and hardly a district in a State, which doesn't have defense spending, contracting, or a defense establishment. We see the effect in public and congressional insistence on continuing contracts, or operating military bases though the need has expired."

"Paradoxically," Senator PROXMIER said a few days ago, "the anything-goes-for-defense attitude may be giving us a weaker military posture as well as a larger bill. The heaviest lobbying pressure—and, inevitably, the most potent with Congress—is to hold on to old weapons, keep old assembly lines rolling, and maintain old jobs. In a time of change and innovation, this could be deadly."

Mr. CLARK. Madam President, I yield the floor.

AMENDMENT OF THE AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10788) to amend section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956.

Mr. HRUSKA. Madam President, on tomorrow we shall begin the debate on the so-called cotton textile bill, House bill 10788.

I rise in support of the Mundt amendment. Briefly stated, the amendment's purpose is to extend to the livestock industry the protective benefits conferred by Presidential action upon the cotton industry against the inroads and injury of imports.

While it cannot be said that section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956, upon which the President's action is based, is the most desirable legislation, yet if it is to be used, it should be equitably and fairly extended to major parts of agriculture in need of its benefits—rather than to be applied in a discriminatory and partial manner to only one.

Section 204, Agricultural Act of 1956, reads as follows:

The President is authorized to negotiate agreements with foreign governments in an

effort to limit the export to the United States of agricultural commodities or products, including textiles or textile products.

The powers and scope of this section are unlimited. In fact, they are absolute. Thus, it could be said they compose the sovereignty of the Nation—exercised by the conscience of the Chief Executive. Surely that conscience is not narrow, restrictive, or small. Those of us who are supporting the Mundt amendment believe that, upon due consideration, all concerned will view this bill in the larger, more comprehensive sense which will more truly approximate its intended purpose, if it is to be used at all.

It should include the livestock, poultry, dairy, and timber industries, as well as cotton. The Mundt amendment will achieve this. It reads as follows:

Provided, however, That no agreement in regard to cotton and cotton textiles shall be enforced pursuant to the provisions of this section until such time as the President has negotiated agreements with representatives of foreign nations limiting in like manner the export to the United States from foreign countries of the following commodities: beef and beef products, pork and pork products, fresh and frozen lamb, poultry and poultry products, dairy products, timber, and timber products.

The U.S. Government now pays exporters of cotton a subsidy of 8.5 cents a pound on both raw cotton and the cotton content of manufactured goods, to make these items competitive at world prices.

Cottongrowers in America and the textile mills abroad are very happy with this arrangement. But textile mills within the United States are very distressed as a result thereof, because they know that with the low wage scale of foreign textile mills, the already precarious condition of American mills will deteriorate further.

Already, several steps have been taken to assist them in their plight. For example, not too long ago a new depreciation schedule for textile machinery was announced; the President, through his Secretary of Agriculture, had petitioned the Tariff Commission for imposition of an import equalization fee on imported cotton goods of 8.5 cents a pound, to offset the cost advantage in raw cotton enjoyed by foreign manufacturers, since domestic manufacturers must buy at supported prices; a tentative agreement was reached among 19 nations, including the United States, to limit foreign sales of cotton textiles to the United States, this being done pursuant to section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 to which I have already referred; and, finally, the introduction of the pending bills—one in the House of Representatives and one in the Senate—which would enable the President to regulate—presumably to the point of prohibition—any cotton textile imports from non-agreement countries.

It would appear that these steps are warranted on account of the distressing and receding state of textile manufacture in the United States. Such recession is evident because the number of textile workers has progressively diminished. In fact, in 15 years by about some 300,000 workers or 28 percent. Also, the

number of mills closed in that period of time numbered about 844. Furthermore, imports of textiles were \$112 million greater than exports in 1960—a reversal of balance, as against previous years.

Generally, there is sympathy for the plight of textile manufacturers in the United States. Generally, there is gratification that something can be and is being done about it. One would be crass indeed if he did not rejoice in the saving of American jobs; in the continued use of American factories and equipment; in an increase of American volume of business, particularly at a time when the Nation so badly needs to get moving ahead once again.

However, the steps taken as enumerated, even though warranted, are being scanned with great misgiving and suspicion, and rightly so, because of the nature of the proposal before us in the general background of legislation on the same subject being processed by Congress.

In H.R. 10783 and S. 3006 we have a strong, outright, protectionist measure being advocated by the Democratic administration, and being approved and urged for passage by practically all of its departments and agencies having anything to do with this area of activity. It is not only a protectionist measure, but it is stronger than a McKinley bill, in fact, because the latter depended only on tariff, while the pending measure depends on subsidy, international cartel, strict import regulation, even prohibition in certain cases.

PENDING BILL AT COMPLETE VARIANCE WITH
TRADE EXPANSION BILL, H.R. 9900

The measure before the Senate is, and should be, suspect because it is at complete variance with declared objectives of major national basic legislation and policy proposed and advocated by the administration. Consider the terrific effort being expended in every way and by virtually every personage prominent in the administration for favorable consideration of H.R. 9900.

Its statement of purposes is lofty and inspiring. In fact, it is almost irresistible. Who could possibly summon enough nerve to oppose it? It reads:

Sec. 102. Statement of purposes: It is the purpose of this act, by lowering trade barriers through trade agreements affording mutual benefits, to stimulate the economic growth of the United States, maintain an enlarged foreign market for the products of the U.S. industry and agriculture, and make available to the hope of the United States a greater variety of goods at lower prices; to strengthen economic and political relations with the European Economic Community in foreign countries through the development of an open and nondiscriminatory trading system in the free world; to assist in the sound economic progress of countries in the earlier stages of economic development; and to encounter economic penetration by international communism.

This is indeed a noble statement of principle. But in view of the pending measure with its strong, across-the-board support from the administration's departments and many agencies, one can rightly question whether H.R. 9900 was offered and is advocated in complete good faith.

Virtually a complete negation and denial of H.R. 9900 is found in provisions and implications of H.R. 10788.

First. H.R. 9900 envisions "a greater variety of goods at lower prices" for the U.S. consumer. But the pending bill will cut down volume and variety by international cartel already agreed upon, and by the import prohibitions placed upon nonagreement countries which will ensue if this bill is enacted into law.

Second. H.R. 9900 calls for "an open and nondiscriminatory trading system in the free world." But the bill before us provides for a closed, restricted, and highly discriminatory arrangement among nations.

Third. H.R. 9900 glories in its lowered trade barriers as an assist in the sound economic progress of countries in the earlier stages of economic development. But in the pending measure there is a startling and notable absence of any so-called underdeveloped nations in the list of those participating in the agreement. In fact, the very nature and substance of that agreement actually excludes and obstructs the sound economic progress of underdeveloped—those in the earlier stages of economic development.

PENDING BILL DENIES DECLARED OBJECTIVES OF
PRESIDENT'S TRADE AGREEMENT PROGRAM

The President's request for passage of the pending bill is a denial of his numerous lofty declarations of what a more liberal trade policy will mean to progress of America, moreover. Consider these three elements which are inherent in the pending bill:

First. The Government subsidy of cotton exports.

Second. Entry of the United States into an international cartel which places quotas on imports from 18 nations on their cotton textile products.

Third. Seeking of power in pending measure to absolutely regulate, to the point of prohibiting, imports of cotton textiles from nonagreement countries.

Each and every one of these points is alien and opposed to the President's frequent and emphatic calls for a more liberal trade policy. Even a casual reference to the text of his January 25 message relative to the reciprocal trade agreements program, delivered to Congress earlier this year, proves this to be a fact. Here are some of them clearly illustrating the point:

1. Indeed, freer movement of trade between America and the Common Market would bolster the economy of the entire free world, stimulating each nation to do most what it does best.

2. To try to shield the American industry from the discipline of foreign competition would isolate our domestic price level from world prices, encourage domestic inflation, reduce our exports still further, and invite less desirable governmental solutions.

3. If we can take this step, Marxist predictions of capitalist empires warring over markets and stifling competition, would be shattered for all time.

4. We will prove to the world that we believe in peacefully tearing down walls instead of arbitrarily building them. We will be opening new vistas of choice and opportunity to the producers and consumers of the free world.

5. We must make certain that any arrangements which we make with the European

Economic Community are worked out in such a fashion as to insure nondiscriminatory application to all third countries. Even more important, however, the United States and Europe together have a joint responsibility to all of the less developed countries of the world, and in this sense we must work together to insure that their legitimate aspirations and requirements are fulfilled. The open partnership which this bill proposes will enable all free nations to share together the rewards of a wider economic choice for all.

6. The American consumer benefits most of all from an increase in foreign trade. Imports give him a wider choice of product at competitive prices. * * * Increased imports stimulate our own efforts to increase efficiency, and supplement antitrust and other efforts to assure competition.

All of the foregoing are excerpts from the President's message to Congress on January 25 relating to the reciprocal trade agreements program. Each and every one of them are violated in spirit by the advocacy of the pending measure which is based upon Government subsidy of exports, international cartel, and a request for authority to impose absolute import prohibitions on non-agreement countries to that cartel.

Especially cynical, however, is that quotation regarding the American consumer. Our Chief Executive has always catered excessively to the American consumer—there are so many of them. In his special message relating to consumer interest, he especially went overboard, promising them virtually everything, at no price increase or cost to them whatsoever, but signally failing to give that which the consumer desires and needs the most; namely, surcease from further Government intervention, and a reduction of Government expense instead of an increase thereof.

The Senator from Nebraska respectfully submits that the consumer under the pending bill will pay twice and dearly; the first time by furnishing the taxes to pay the subsidies which lead to high prices for consumer items; and, secondly, the higher prices he must pay for those items when he wishes to use them.

To speak so beguilingly of competitive prices and of supplementing antitrust and other efforts to assure competition is especially out of order, because an international cartel has for its very essence the formation of a trust, the creation of a monopolistic entity, rather than having any semblance or likeness to supplemental antitrust character.

To summarize, there is absolute contradiction between the pending bill and the President's reciprocal trade agreements program as set out in H.R. 9900. They are mutually exclusive. To borrow a figure of speech used by one of our colleagues in the other body during debate on this proposition, the Democratic administration is urging us to be voting protectionist and flying the flag of free trade both at one and the same time.

STATUTORY BASIS OF GENEVA AGREEMENT

In July 1961 a short-term cotton textile arrangement was agreed upon by 19 countries, including the United States, in Geneva, Switzerland. It was designated "cotton textile arrangement," as was its successor, the long-term docu-

ment agreed upon in February 1962 in Geneva. A more accurate and plain title would be "Cotton Textile Cartel."

Mr. President, a cartel is defined in the dictionary as follows:

An international combination of independent enterprises in the same branch of production, aiming at a monopolistic control of the market by means of weakening or eliminating competition.

In short, an international cartel is what we are concerned and dealing with.

President Kennedy undertook to make the United States a signatory to that cartel pursuant to statutory authority contained in section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956, which reads as follows:

The President is authorized to negotiate agreements with foreign governments in an effort to limit the export to the United States of agricultural commodities or products, including textiles or textile products.

It would appear that the President acted within the authority conferred on him by that statute, in entering into the Geneva agreement. However, that does not make it a wise decision, nor does it endow that provision with virtue or acceptability.

While there may be a great many reasons for lack of virtue or acceptability, I cite only two: First, exercise of power thereunder makes a shamble of the Trade Agreements Act as it now exists. It completely bypasses Tariff Commission procedures, the peril point clause of the Trade Agreements Act, the escape clause, and the defense clause thereof.

Secondly, section 204 contains no guideline, standards, or prescribed procedures by which the President should act, or by which industries might apply for and be accorded relief by the President into that section. Thus, he can exercise the power thus granted in arbitrary and dictatorial fashion, conferring survival and life to one industry or one sector of American economy, and without being accountable for reasons denying life and survival, or continued prosperity, as the case may be, to another industry or private sector of our economy.

Such potential power is much too great to be existent and exerciseable at the hands of one man in such fashion. It is well that the Congress should review such provision and all similar grants of absolute and unaccountable power which might be envisioned in H.R. 9900 now in process of being formulated.

REQUESTED EXTENSION OF SECTION 204

Notwithstanding the foregoing considerations, the pending bill requests an extension of the Presidential powers which the section already contained. The extension would empower the President to impose export regulations, including outright bans, as against non-agreement countries; that is, countries which are not members of the international cartel pertaining to cotton textiles.

The justification for this is declared to be that the "President must have this authority if he is to protect the integrity of the Geneva agreement."

Madam President, there is also the integrity of other sectors of American agriculture to protect. It is well that a beleaguered textile industry will reap the benefits of this legislation and the

international cartel formulated in Geneva. But the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] and some of his colleagues, including the Senator from Nebraska, feel that some protection should also be afforded, while this opportunity presents itself, to other parts of the American farm picture; to wit, raisers and processors of beef and beef products, pork and pork products, fresh and frozen lamb, poultry and poultry products, dairy products, and timber and timber products.

WHAT MUNDT AMENDMENT WOULD DO

The Mundt amendment would not negate or cancel in any way the cotton textile agreement. Having gone as far as it now exists, the amendment would be permitted to go to a point of enforcement, including the text of the pending bill which is now before us; conditioned, however, upon the President's negotiating agreements with foreign nations limiting in like manner the export to the United States from such foreign countries of beef and beef products, pork and pork products, fresh and frozen lamb, poultry and poultry products, dairy products, timber and timber products.

For many years imports of livestock and meat products have been a very disturbing and an injurious factor in the livestock market. For the time being, I confine my remarks to cattle, and lamb, because it is in that field that efforts were made under the present Trade Agreements Act to seek relief. In two instances in the last 2 years such relief was unsuccessfully petitioned.

The imports involved may have been considered relatively insignificant in proportion to the huge consumption of beef within the United States. However, it was submitted that even that quantity of such livestock and its products had a depressing effect on the domestic market, not only upon fed cattle but likewise on beef products.

The livestock market is one which functions strictly according to supply and demand. It therefore follows unquestionably that increased supplies arising from importations cause a domestic market to decline, thereby injuring U.S. producers. Domestic production fluctuates from time to time, but this is a normal situation that livestock feeders expect and can anticipate with some degree of accuracy. The rate of importation of products concerned, however, is difficult to anticipate or to appraise with any degree of accuracy.

In the case of beef and beef products, imports tend to be of a lower quality than generally is obtained from fed cattle such as those generally sold in this country. Such imports are used largely for prepared meats, hamburger, and ground beef. However, since these items are offered to consumers in nearly all retail markets along with higher quality fresh beef from domestic production, they are directly competitive with the higher quality fresh cuts and tend to depress the market for the quality items produced domestically.

For decades, records of cattle and beef industry in the United States have shown definite fluctuations in domestic production and domestic prices. These trends

have become known as the cattle cycle. An examination of those records will show that imports of beef products and cattle in the past have followed such cattle cycles rather closely. As domestic production declined and prices advanced, imports rose. Subsequently, when domestic production increased and prices declined, imports also declined. There can be no question but that the importation in such quantities during periods of high prices has a depressing effect on our domestic market extending over a period beyond the high price part of the cycle, and as a result injury is visited upon the domestic industry.

Beyond such market manifestations, it is submitted that imports of beef, beef cattle, and beef products will continue at higher levels than have prevailed previously. Facilities to handle imports are being established in this country in a manner that appears to be permanent. Conversions, costing huge amounts of money, are being made in transportation equipment. It seems logical that these expenditures would not be made unless those individuals and concerns involved expected to continue their use.

Now as to volume in beef and veal imports: In 1958 total imports of beef and beef products constituted 8.6 percent of total beef and veal production; in 1959 the total imports were again 8.6 percent of such total production; in 1960, they were 5.9 percent; and in 1961 they were 7.9 percent.

Statistics on lambs and mutton are even more distressing. They are as follows: 61 percent in 1958, 14.4 percent in 1959, 11.5 percent in 1960, and 12.1 percent in 1961.

The foregoing statistics are those of Economic Research Service, Department of Agriculture.

It is noteworthy indeed that in 1960 imports of cotton textiles amounted to 6 percent of total U.S. consumption.

No doubt in each case there are the dangers of increased importation; there are the stern realities of a depressing effect on the domestic market of such imports; and the same drastic and urgent need for the relief requested. In one instance it is the passage of the bill itself, and in the second instance it is the adoption of the Mundt amendment.

It has been pointed out that the 18 signatories to the cartel counted for about 90 percent of the imports of cotton textiles into the United States. The few countries that were not brought into the cartel counted for some 10 percent of the volume of those textiles entering this country. In the words of one of the Representatives during the debate in the other body:

That 10 percent could disrupt, that 10 percent could have a most adverse effect upon the 90 percent that we attempted to correct by the arrangement that was entered into at Geneva. It would frustrate the agreement, if something is not done to amend the act to give the President this authority to write regulations affecting those countries who were not participants to the arrangement.

That same logic, that same reasoning, and that same relative situation obtains in the areas provided for by the Mundt amendment.

The amendment should be adopted. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, May 15, 1962, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled joint resolution (S.J. Res. 185) to defer the proclamation of marketing quotas and acreage allotments for the 1963 crop of wheat.

ADJOURNMENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PASTORE in the chair). Pursuant to the order previously entered, the Senate will stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

Accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.), the Senate adjourned, pursuant to the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 16, 1962, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 15 (legislative day of May 14), 1962:

U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE

John D. Butzner, Jr., of Virginia, to be U.S. district judge for the eastern district of Virginia vice Albert V. Bryan, elevated.

U.S. ASSAY OFFICE

Paul J. Maguire, of New York, to be assayer of the U.S. Assay Office at New York, N.Y.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

Howard William Habermeyer, of Illinois, to be a member of the Railroad Retirement Board for the term of 5 years from August 29, 1962. (Reappointment.)

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 15 (legislative day of May 14), 1962:

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Byron D. Woodside, of Virginia, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for the term of 5 years expiring June 5, 1967. (Reappointment.)

U.S. ATTORNEY

Robert C. Zampano, of Connecticut, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Connecticut for the term of 4 years.

U.S. MARSHAL

Joseph T. Ploszaj, of Connecticut, to be U.S. marshal for district of Connecticut for the term of 4 years.

H. R. 10788

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

MAY 15 (legislative day, MAY 14), 1962

Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

AMENDMENT

Proposed by Mr. MUNDT (for himself, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. ALLOTT, and Mr. CURTIS) to the bill (H.R. 10788) to amend section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956, viz:

1 On page 1, line 12, strike out the period and quotation
2 marks, insert a colon, and add the following: "*Provided,*
3 *however,* That no agreement in regard to cotton and cotton
4 textiles shall be enforced pursuant to the provisions of this
5 section until such time as the President has negotiated agree-
6 ments with representatives of foreign nations limiting in like
7 manner the export to the United States from foreign countries
8 of the following commodities: Beef and beef products, pork
9 and pork products, fresh and frozen lamb, poultry and
10 poultry products, timber and timber products, and dairy
11 products."

AMENDMENT

Proposed by Mr. MUNDY (for himself, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. ALLOT, and Mr. CURTIS) to the bill (H.R. 10788) to amend section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956.

MAY 15 (legislative day, MAY 14), 1962

Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF
BUDGET AND FINANCE

(For information only;
should not be quoted
or cited)

Issued May 17, 1962
For actions of May 16, 1962
87th-2d, No. 78

CONTENTS

| | | |
|--|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| Administrative procedure.....24 | Farm loans.....12 | Meat grading.....3 |
| Agricultural cooperative leadership.....22 | Farm program....1,13,26,39 | Minerals.....36 |
| Agricultural imports....10 | Feed grains.....39 | Organization.....2 |
| ASC committee.....32 | Flood control.....37 | Patents.....8 |
| Budget.....25,28 | Foreign aid.....22 | Personnel.....30,33 |
| Civil defense.....7 | Forestry.....18,34 | Prices.....35 |
| Copyrights.....8 | Health.....20 | Property.....16 |
| Dairy program.....11 | Land reform.....22 | Public works.....4,14 |
| Electrification.....27 | Lands.....5,37 | Reclamation.....9 |
| | Legislative program....23 | Research.....29 |
| | Manpower training.....25 | Retirement.....33 |
| | | River basin.....31 |
| | | Roads.....34 |
| | | Ryukyu Islands.....6 |
| | | Science.....2 |
| | | Social security.....17 |
| | | Soil conservation.....27 |
| | | Soviet foreign policy...21 |
| | | Sugar.....15 |
| | | Territories.....6 |
| | | Transportation.....40 |
| | | Wheat.....38 |
| | | Wildlife.....19 |

HIGHLIGHTS: House committee reported farm bill. Reps. Battin and Beermann urged investigation of Estes case. Senate debated bill for agricultural import restrictions on nonparticipating countries in multilateral trade agreements. Sen. Proxmire defended cost of dairy program. Sen. Humphrey commended work of Farmers Home Administration. House rejected resolution to disapprove Reorganization Plan to create Office of Science and Technology. Rep. Derounian urged investigation of Estes case and inserted article. Rep. Wilson, Calif., inserted article criticizing dismissal of certain Mont. ASC committee officials.

HOUSE

1. FARM PROGRAM. The Agriculture Committee reported with amendment H. R. 11222, the proposed Food and Agriculture Act of 1962 (H. Rept. 1691). p. 7833

Rep. Andersen, Minn., defended his sale of coal stock to Estes, saying, "my sale of coal stock to Mr. Estes had absolutely nothing to do in any way with his other affairs." p. 7820

Rep. Battin urged investigation of the Department of Agriculture, saying, "the Billie Sol Estes matter is but one example of the high-handed attitude of the Department in dealing with the rights of not only the taxpayer but also elected officials in government." p. 7819

Rep. Beermann criticized the USDA, saying, "The Department of Agriculture's attitude in attempting to cover up this mess has taken on the dimensions of a national disgrace," and urged investigation of the Estes case. p. 7819

Rep. Matthews reviewed the accomplishments of Rep. Harding, especially with regard to agricultural legislation. pp. 7829-31

2. ORGANIZATION; SCIENCE. Rejected H. Res. 595, disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 2 to create an office of science and technology. pp. 7820-6
3. MEATS; GRADING. Rep. Cunningham criticized the USDA's proposed dual grading system for beef and inserted letters from a number of packers criticizing the system. pp. 7827-9
4. PUBLIC WORKS. The "Daily Digest" states that the Public Works Committee "Met in executive session and ordered reported favorably to the House H. R. 10113 (amended), to provide the President with standby authority to inaugurate a public works acceleration program to help combat a recession." p. D375
5. LANDS. The "Daily Digest" states that the Government Operations Committee "Met in executive session and adopted a subcommittee report entitled, 'Land Appraisal Practices -- Department of Interior.'" p. D375
6. TERRITORIES. Received from the Army a letter relative to estimating the additional overhead costs relating to the economic and social development in the Ryukyu Islands. p. 7833
The Armed Services Committee reported without amendment H. R. 10937, to amend the act providing for the economic and social development in the Ryukyu Islands (H. Rept. 1684). p. 7833
7. CIVIL DEFENSE. The Armed Services Committee reported without amendment H. R. 11743, to amend the provisions of title III of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended to extend the emergency authority of the President to June 30, 1966 (H. Rept. 1685). p. 7833
8. PATENTS; COPYRIGHTS. Subcommittee No. 3 of the Judiciary Committee voted to report to the full committee H. R. 10966, to fix the fees payable to the Patent Office, and with amendment H. J. Res. 627, to extend the duration of copyright protection in certain cases. p. D375
9. RECLAMATION. The Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee voted to report to the full committee with amendments H. R. 575, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the upper division of the Baker Federal reclamation project, Ore. p. D375

SENATE

10. AGRICULTURAL IMPORTS. Continued debate on H. R. 10788, to amend Sec. 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 so as to authorize the President to regulate imports of agricultural commodities, including textiles and textile products, from nonparticipating countries of multilateral trade agreements (pp. 7875-98, 7908-12, 7931). Agreed to a unanimous consent agreement to terminate debate on an amendment by Sen. Mundt at 2:30 p.m., Thurs., May 17, and to limit debate on an amendment by Sen. Miller to 30 minutes, and limit debate on final passage to 30 minutes (p. 7885).
11. DAIRY PROGRAM. Sen. Proxmire contended that "the cost of the dairy programs has been much more modest over the years than has the cost of the cotton, feed grains, and wheat programs, in virtually every respect," and inserted a table to support his position. p. 7847

welcoming him to our State as one of the descendants of the Mexican effort. We appreciated his presence there.

The close ties between our country and their country predate the settlement in the continental United States now existing, including the settlement of St. Augustine, which is the oldest permanent settlement now in the United States.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I am full of enthusiasm in joining the Senator from Alabama and our two leaders here, Senator Mansfield and Senator Dirksen, indeed, all of the Members in the Senate, in giving a hearty welcome to representatives of the great free Government of a great, proud, and free people, who, as our leader here on the Republican side has said, represent a close and beloved American neighbor.

I come from California. A great deal of our culture and our history that we know in California trace their origin to the land represented so ably and gallantly by the gentlemen from Mexico, our fellow parliamentarians, and honor us with their presence on this occasion. We have had an opportunity this week to discuss in frank and friendly fashion across the table problems that have vexed and plagued the Government of Mexico and the Government of the United States.

I believe we have made progress toward just solutions in those areas we have discussed.

It seems to me one of the great things we have accomplished, I say to my colleague, the chairman of our delegation on the Senate side, has been to undertake those annual meetings between representatives of the legislative branches of our two great countries, Mexico and the United States.

Quiero decir por todo, el Senado, Bienvenidos, Senores.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, as the Senator from the State of Colorado I could not listen to these tributes without saying something, because probably no other State has been more influenced by its heritage of Mexican culture than my own State.

I am sure all of you know that the oldest town in Colorado, San Luis, is now approaching 300 years of age. I am sure you know that 4 years before the Declaration of Independence was signed General de Anza, with 3,000 men, about 30 miles south of Pueblo, there defeated the great Indian Chief Cuerno Verde, which in effect established your people on the American Continent.

We have in my own State many of your people—descendants of your countrymen, and those who have recently come from your country. We could not feel other than very close to you.

I know it will be impossible for us to surpass the hospitality which you have shown to various Members of the Senate and of the House when they have visited with you in Mexico. I only hope that you will take home with you from us a feeling of real welcome, a feeling that we believe the opportunity to discuss our mutual problems with each other can be only beneficial to us, and to the benefit of both countries.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, now that some of the junior States have been heard from in their thanks to our sister Republic, I, being from a State with some antiquity in relation to our associations with Mexico, wish to join with the leaders and with the Senator from Alabama in expressing thanks to these gentlemen for being here today.

I might point out that 420 years ago the cross was carried to the United States, to what is now Arizona, from Mexico. Cattle came into this country, from Mexico into Arizona.

Much of the culture we enjoy in Arizona—most of our names, our basic language, over 25 percent of our people—stem from the country of Mexico.

We have known all of our lives of these delightful people. I have been raised among them. I am much indebted to them, for their kindness, their warmth, their generosity, and their understanding.

I believe that we in North America, in the United States, can well pattern ourselves after them. Frankly, I have never heard of a Mexican dying of a heart attack. They have the "mañana" spirit. I wish we had more of that in the United States. We get so excited in this country that we want something to happen last night. They are willing to work a little longer, to be a little more patient, and as a result they get more done. There is a country after which we could pattern ours.

I have always been impressed by the sincerity and devotion of Mexicans to liberty and freedom. We in this Republic of the United States profess such sincerity, but I assure you, Mr. President, we cannot hold a candle to the Mexican people when it comes to living up to the ideals of liberty and of freedom.

To our guests I say, as one who has spent his life among you, who has visited your country, who has visited with people from your country in his State, I wish to thank you for being here and in a few words to say, "Buena suerte. Hasta luego."

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I do not wish to prolong this ceremony unduly, for I know these gentlemen are due at a meeting, but I would be untrue to my inner feelings if I did not rise to express my appreciation for the wonderful treatment the Mexican Congressmen gave to us a year ago last February in Guadalajara. It was one of the warmest and most friendly receptions I have ever experienced in my life, beginning when we landed at the airport and continuing throughout all meetings until they waved us goodbye as we boarded the plane a week later. It was a very interesting and helpful experience.

We shall always be indebted to our friends south of the border for a memory of one of the friendliest occasions one could experience.

RECESS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate may stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair, to permit Senators to greet our distinguished visitors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. METCALF in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Alabama? The Chair hears none, and the Senate will now stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

At 2 o'clock and 26 minutes p.m., the Senate took a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The Members of the visiting delegation were escorted to a position on the floor of the Senate at the rear of the Chamber, and were there greeted by Members of the Senate.

Following the informal reception, the distinguished visitors were escorted from the Chamber.

At 2 o'clock and 32 minutes p.m., the Senate reassembled, and was called to order by the Presiding Officer.

ACQUISITION OF PATENTED MINING CLAIM ON SOUTH RIM OF GRAND CANYON NATIONAL PARK

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 383) to provide for the acquisition of a patented mining claim on the south rim of Grand Canyon National Park, and for other purposes, which were, on page 3, line 12, strike out "designated" and insert "designed"; on page 4, line 6, strike out "apex" and insert "extralateral", and on page 4, line 21, after "Claim" insert: "*Provided further, That neither the enactment of this Act nor anything contained in it shall be construed to relieve any party from any liability which would or might otherwise exist for the removal of ore from beyond the boundaries of said Orphan Claim, if any such removal occurred prior to the enactment of this Act.*"

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, the amendments that were added by the House might be classified in the following categories: Two were technical amendments. The third was an amendment that made very clear that if there was any removal of ores from Government land, the enactment of the bill would not be construed to relieve the company or anyone else from liability therefor which might otherwise exist. I have checked the bill with the distinguished leadership on the other side of the aisle and members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. They are in complete agreement. Unless there are questions, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Nevada.

The motion was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF THE AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10788) to amend section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, when the bill before us now is shorn of its technicalities and stripped of its trimming, what remains is a measure which would nail down, clearly and effectively,

the authority of the President to impose quotas on textile imports.

Before discussing the bill in greater detail, let me sketch the background and outline the darkened landscape of this Nation's textile industry.

More than 4 years ago, the plight of the domestic textile industry became a matter of major concern to the Congress, as it already was in major areas of the Nation. Between the end of World War II and 1957, textile employment in the Nation declined 24 percent, a loss of more than 325,000 jobs. More than 700 textile mills had closed their doors and gone out of business for good. Deserted textile mills dotted the landscape from Maine to Georgia. In New Hampshire alone, textile employment had declined by almost 50 percent.

Four years ago, the problems began to give rise to some action. The Senate unanimously adopted a resolution which I presented authorizing a special inquiry into the problems of the domestic textile industry. The able Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] was named chairman of the special Textile Subcommittee of the Senate Commerce Committee, and it has been my pleasure to serve with him on that committee.

The special subcommittee held extensive hearings, in Washington and in textile centers throughout the country, into the problems of the industry, and we have followed up the initial hearings with further inquiries, the latest of which took place earlier this year. The subcommittee has issued three different reports on its finding.

One major thread runs through all our hearings, all our reports and all our recommendations. It is that controls, or quotas, on textile imports offer the only effective means of safeguarding the American textile industry from low-wage foreign imports, and the only realistic way to assure a continuation of its ability to supply the essential defense and civilian needs of the Nation.

Our subcommittee reiterated time and time again its recommendation that textile imports quotas be established. Frankly, however, our suggestions fell upon deaf ears until last year when an interim, 1-year international cotton textile agreement was negotiated at Geneva. That stopgap agreement is scheduled to be replaced this fall by a long-term, 5-year agreement on cotton textiles. Most of the world's major textile trading nations, those accounting for 90 percent of the world trade in cotton, are parties to the agreement. The cotton textile agreement may not go as far as some would have wished. It does not set direct quotas on imports, but it does specify that if the United States determines that imports are causing or threatening to cause a disruption in our textile markets, we may impose import restrictions.

The purpose of this bill, as I understand it, is to make crystal clear the authority of the President to impose such import quotas with respect to all textiles, cotton, wool, and manmade fibers, and to make it clear that such restrictions may be applied against countries which have signed the cotton agreement and against those which are not parties to it.

The bill would also make effective any future agreements involving agricultural products.

I urge the Senate to approve this measure, and, since it has already passed the House, send it to the President for signature.

In urging adoption of the bill, I am deeply aware of the fact that the only international agreement limiting imports which is currently in existence applies exclusively to cotton textiles. Neither woolens, nor worsteds, nor manmade fibers are included, despite the fact that unreasonable foreign competition has been as keen, if not keener in these fabrics as it has been in cottons. And I can only repeat the latest recommendation of our Textile Subcommittee that limits on imports of all categories of every fiber must be set. I hope the enactment of this legislation will spur the executive agencies of the Governments to renewed efforts in behalf of a textile agreement on woolens, worsted and other threatened fabrics.

There are other aspects of this bill that merit some comment.

First. The bill, by confirming the existing law and broadening its provisions, strengthens the power of the President to negotiate with foreign countries in an effort to obtain agreements limiting the importation into the United States of any agricultural commodity or textile product. In this respect, the President is not bound by the chains of law. He is free to enter into any agreement he wishes, and under the bill can enforce it against all other nations. He is not bound by legally established guidelines, or legislative restraints. His power is unbridled.

I cannot forecast what interpretation may be given the provisions of this bill or the law it amends by the President's legal advisers, or, should the occasion arise, by the courts. However, it seems to me from reading this section of the law that the President in securing a reduction of imports in one category could in the same agreement, and as a consideration for the concession, relax import restrictions in other categories.

Let me say frankly that I find this aspect of the bill disquieting. However, I am confident that our Senate Textile Subcommittee, under the able leadership of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] will continue its diligent oversight of all the developments in this field, and will be alert for the significant developments.

Second. There may be some in the Senate who will remark at the divergent philosophy as between this bill and the overall Reciprocal Trade Extension Act still under consideration in the House. From a philosophical standpoint, it may be difficult to reconcile his bill, described in the House of Representatives as McKinley protectionism, with the grand design of freer trade. But to such doubters let me say frankly, I do not believe that farsighted trade measures can be adopted and pursued by this country unless the vital interests of essential American industries are reasonably safeguarded against low-wage, foreign-made goods. This is especially true

in cases like cotton textiles, where foreign produces can buy U.S. cotton, as a result of our farm policies, at a 25 percent lower price than the American textile producer. If we export textile industry jobs right along with our exports of raw cotton, neither the interests of trade nor the interests of this Nation will be advanced.

Mr. President, before I yield the floor I should like to emphasize two points which I believe it is exceedingly necessary to have emphasized in relation to a discussion on this measure. I am happy to see that my very dear friend the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is present. I have read with keen interest the remarks he made on the floor of the Senate yesterday, and I have read the amendment which he, together with the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] and other Senators, is presenting to the bill.

I am sure that all of us appreciate the difficulties which beset those who produce beef and pork and mutton. I am sure all of us appreciate the difficulties that many segments of American industry are experiencing. I know very few vocations in this country that do not face difficulties. Incidentally, in my own section of the country, the inclusion of timber and timber products would be attractive.

However, I earnestly hope that the amendment of my good friends will not be adopted by the Senate, and I most respectfully urge that this is not the time or the place to secure such protection for other commodities.

I wish to reemphasize the fact that the textile industry in this country stands all alone, of the larger industries in the land, in its difficulties. It is literally a dying industry. It is confronted with an emergency of a character that no other American industry faces, or probably has faced in history, on such a grand scale. I should like to remind the Senate again, as I said a few moments ago, that since World War II and until 1957 textile employment in the Nation has declined 24 percent, that we have lost 325,000 jobs in that industry, and that more than 700 textile mills have closed their doors and gone out of business forever. In New Hampshire, we have lost more than 50 percent of our textile employment.

This emergency was recognized, and it resulted in a long and careful study, made by a subcommittee, of which I am proud to be a member, under the leadership of the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE].

The problem has been made the subject of deep concern in the Senate. The President of the United States has indicated that he recognizes the crisis in the textile industry, and has indicated not only by his words but also by his actions that he is prepared to apply special remedies to a special emergency.

The bill, in my opinion, is absolutely essential in our struggle to save what we have left of the textile industry. The bill should go out of the Senate without amendment. It should go out of the Senate without having attached to it any

other subject. It should stand as it is written now.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an observation?

Mr. COTTON. I am very happy to yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. I do not question the sincerity of the proponents of the Mundt amendment. However, as I read the amendment I find one failing in it which, if the amendment is adopted, will result in killing not only the remedy that they seek to obtain but also the remedy that we seek to obtain.

We have worked since 1958 to have that remedy provided. I am sure the Senator from New Hampshire will agree with me that the origin of the crusade in which we are engaged started some time in 1958 when the Senator from New Hampshire submitted his resolution calling for an investigation of the decline of the textile industry. It was as a result of that resolution that we discussed on the floor of the Senate the likelihood of a subcommittee being appointed, which I have had the honor to head after its appointment, and of which the Senator from New Hampshire is a member.

We held exhaustive hearings throughout the country, particularly in the States in which textile workers had lost their jobs, and which had textile mills that were in a very precarious condition.

As a matter of fact, our investigations show that over a period of 10 years, while this Nation was experiencing an astronomical development, economically, the textile industry remained stagnant for a period of 10 years, and that during that period the textile industry lost more than 800 mills and more than 325,000 workers lost their jobs in the textile mills, as the Senator from New Hampshire has pointed out.

In the amendment which will be proposed the sponsors do not say, "If and when we, too, in the cattle industry have achieved a multilateral agreement, that agreement should also be fortified by action of the President." If the amendment had such a provision in it, I would find no fault with it.

After all, we started in 1958. We did hold extensive hearings. We did prove to the country and to the White House that we were in a bad state of affairs. It is true that as a result of that, in May 1961, the President of the United States issued his seven-point declaration. In that declaration he stated, not that he would impose mandatory quotas, but that he would suggest a conference on the part of all the textile exporting countries that they reach a voluntary agreement. That is precisely what we did.

Now what do we find? We find that it is necessary to reach an agreement with the countries exporting meat products, in which the authors of the amendment are very much interested. I sympathize with the position of those Senators. I know they have a tremendous problem. However, I say to them, "In trying to help yourself, do not kill us both. You are not saying 'If and when we, too, have achieved a multilateral agreement, we will go to the President of the United States for the same au-

thority in meats that he has in textiles.' You are not saying that at all. You are saying in your amendment that before the President can implement the multilateral agreement which has already been negotiated and achieved we will force him to get into a multilateral agreement that concerns meats. You are going a little bit too far in this matter, because you have a long row to hoe before you get to the position where we are, for the simple reason that we have made this investigation. I do not question the fact that you have a problem with reference to meats, but I say, please, do not do it here. If you win, you will have destroyed both of us."

Mr. COTTON. I thank the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island for his contribution, which he presented with his usual ability and vigor. The question, I respectfully say to the Senate, is whether the textile industry in this country is in a unique position. Sometimes I am rather amused by the use of the word "unique," when people say ungrammatically that something is rather unique or a little unique. As I understand Webster's definition of the word, it means all alone, and that there can be no degree.

If the textile industry were not in the perilous situation which puts it in a unique position, I would not utter a word of criticism. In fact, I have no criticism. I would not oppose them so vigorously. I admire my friends from Nebraska and South Dakota and elsewhere who are here, as they always are, fighting for the good and the prosperity of those whom they represent. If the textile industry were not alone in its situation, it would be proper to reach out and load this bill up or attempt to load it up with this industry and that industry and some other industry. There are other industries in my own State that could be considered in this connection.

I am anxious about the shoe and leather industry. I am anxious about the electronics industry. I am anxious about the timber and timber products industry. The latter is included in the proposed amendment. But my point is that the textile industry—and I think it will be recognized by all fair-minded persons who give careful consideration to the subject—stands alone in this country in the desperation of its situation.

As the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] has so well pointed out already, an agreement has been entered into, for the effectiveness of which the passage of the bill is necessary. If we confine the proposal as contained in the bill to the textile industry and vote on that alone, I am sure the bill will pass and will be at least an added aid in saving this industry. But if we start to adopt amendments and load the bill with other interests not connected with the textile industry, interests which, while they have their just place and their just appeal, have not been the subject of prolonged, painstaking study by the Senate and its committees, and have not challenged the attention of the President of the United States—and obviously

he would hardly start at this time to make an exception of any industry unless he was completely convinced that it stood alone in its requirements—then the bill will be lost.

In the Committee on Ways and Means of the other body the President's trade expansion bill is on the agenda for consideration. In due time, I assume the bill may well reach the Senate for our consideration. The Members of this body will have to take many considerations into account in dealing with that bill. However, I appeal to the Senate not to start to prejudice anyone's case at this time, and not to make the bill a reason for shooting from the hip, at random, concerning a subject which is perhaps the most complicated that has been presented to Congress, and is fraught with the most serious consequences in history, at least during my period of service in either the House or Senate. Let us take care of those items when they have been properly considered, but let us confine the bill to its purpose, which is to try to save the textile industry.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. COTTON. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Before the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire yields the floor, I wish to express my commendation to him for his pioneering work in this field.

As the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] has stated, this problem was brought most forcefully to my attention and, I presume, to the attention of other Senators by the resolution which the Senator from New Hampshire authored in 1958. Both he and the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island have rendered magnificent service in this field.

I have attended several meetings dealing with this problem, which were presided over by the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island. I share the view of the Senator from New Hampshire that it would be unfortunate if the bill were to be complicated by having it include many other items.

The textile and garment industries are of tremendous importance in the State of New York. I agree that there are many other industries which are seriously affected by trade. There are many others where an international agreement no doubt would be welcome. However, it is probably true, as the Senator from Rhode Island has said so well, that if they were all included in this bill, the death knell would be sounded for all the industries in which we are interested, for this bill then would be unduly complicated and would surely get defeated or lost in the legislative mill.

New York City is the world's leading center for the manufacture of clothing. In New York State there are many other centers of garment making, including my home city of Rochester and the cities of Amsterdam, Utica, Gloversville, Troy, Auburn, and Kingston.

The apparel industry in New York City employs a quarter of a million people. This is more than the entire population of Alaska, and just a little less than the total population of Nevada. It

is one-third of the population of the city of Washington, D.C. All these people are employed in one industry in the city of New York. Therefore, the bill is of great importance to my State.

I sincerely trust that it will be enacted promptly, and will not become complicated by the amendments which, I feel certain, are sincerely advocated by distinguished Members of this body who have real problems in this area. Mr. President, this is not protection. For many years, our country has been most generous in accepting textiles and garments from other countries of the world. Our markets have been open. The result has been that certain sectors of the American textile industry have been significantly affected. Workers have lost their jobs and machinery and equipment has been idled. The aggravating thing about all of this is that, while we have taken steps to accelerate trade and to encourage it, other countries have not followed suit. Whereas we have accepted these imports, others have not. The purpose of the multilateral textile agreement which has been negotiated is to spread out the burden—to see to it that every country accepts its fair share of world exports of textiles and garments.

As one who is a believer in expanded trade and a supporter, in principle, of the trade program which has been proposed to us, I have always believed that progress toward expanded trade must be orderly progress. I stress the word "orderly." We must not expand trade in a helter-skelter fashion, which could result in a serious economic disaster for certain American communities and industries.

Every other country of the world accepts this principle. Orderly trade expansion is one of the greatest hopes of the free world. It will help us greatly in the battle against the Soviet bloc which does not have nearly the economic power and financial resources of the West.

Free trade is not exclusively an American undertaking. Free trade takes co-operation.

The textile agreement which has been negotiated does satisfy two important requirements. It will permit the orderly expansion of trade and avoid the kind of disruption which weakens everyone. Second, it requires that other countries of the West cooperate with us in spreading the burden of the burgeoning world production in textiles, garments, and related products.

Mr. President, one final word; an ambitious and far-reaching international agreement on textiles has been negotiated. It establishes a new concept. It says that the nations of the free world must join together in seeing that each accepts an equal burden in the interest of expanding trade. I am anxious to see this legislation pass so that there will be no legislative hurdles to the effective implementation of this ambitious agreement. I would point out however that it is of the utmost importance that our Government acts to see to it that other nations of the world

lives up to the provisions here established.

We must insist in this agreement and in other matters affecting trade that our partners of the West also work to achieve expanded trade. We must press for the sharing of the burden on commodities like textiles. We must press for the removal of nontariff barriers, particularly on American agricultural commodities. We must press to see to it that reciprocal trade is truly reciprocal.

A trade program is only as good as the people who administer it. The new trade bill before the Senate, this international agreement on textiles and our existing tariffs on trade require firm backing and forceful application. This is not to say that we are being narrowminded. Many nations of the free world are strong and it is imperative that we work together.

I hope the position taken by the Senator from New Hampshire will be sustained and that the bill will not become further complicated.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. COTTON. I yield.

Mr. MUSKIE. The distinguished Senator from New Hampshire whom I desire to commend for his excellent statement today, has suggested to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] and the cosponsors of the amendment that they should seek elsewhere relief similar to that which is provided in the bill.

I should like to ask the Senator from New Hampshire whether, under section 204, which is in issue, the livestock industry, which would benefit under the amendment sponsored by the Senator from Nebraska, would be eligible for similar relief. I call the Senator's attention to the following language of section 204:

The President may, whenever he determines such action appropriate, negotiate with representatives of foreign governments in an effort to obtain agreements limiting the export from such countries and the importation into the United States of any agricultural commodity or product manufactured therefrom or textiles or textile products * * *.

Does the language "any agricultural commodity or product manufactured therefrom" include livestock products?

Mr. COTTON. The Senator was quoting from the law, not from the bill, was he not?

Mr. MUSKIE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. COTTON. I should say that that language clearly includes all of the commodities mentioned in the proposed amendment which qualify as agricultural products, and such products surely include livestock of every kind and variety.

Mr. MUSKIE. So the objective sought by the authors of the amendment is permitted under existing law, provided that they can persuade the President to undertake negotiations, and provided, further, that the effected countries agree to negotiate.

Mr. COTTON. That is perfectly true. The authors of the amendment are in exactly the same situation as that in

which the Senator from New Hampshire finds himself, and in which I feel certain the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], and Senators from other textile States find themselves.

I take this opportunity to express the earnest hope that the President and his advisers will see fit to exercise their authority in regard to wool, worsted, and manmade fibers, as well as to cotton.

And in the same way the President may be importuned to include the agricultural products for which the distinguished Senator from Nebraska and the distinguished Senator from South Dakota are striving. Of course, the only agreement which actually has been made has to do with cotton textiles; but this act includes all of these.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield for another question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PELL in the chair). Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. COTTON. I yield.

Mr. MUSKIE. The pending bill, as I see it, does not in any way restrict the eligibility of the livestock industry to apply for similar relief.

Mr. COTTON. I am sure it does not.

Mr. MUSKIE. Like the Senator from New Hampshire, I am interested in other industries in my own State and in northern New England which might be eligible for similar relief. To indicate the breadth of the eligibility which is available under existing law, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from New Hampshire a letter on this subject from the General Counsel of the Department of Agriculture, John C. Bagwell, to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. The letter has to do with the question of whether forestry products would be included; but in the discussion of that question, the authorities he cites indicate the breadth of the eligibility covered by the language "agricultural products or products manufactured therefrom."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Maine? Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I have been requested by my colleague, the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MURPHY], who is necessarily absent, to inform the Senate that he joins in the expressions made in my remarks here this afternoon, and he hopes the bill will be passed without being complicated by amendments.

EXHIBIT 1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL,
Washington, D.C., April 4, 1962.

HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Agriculture
and Forestry.

DEAR SENATOR ELLENDER: Mr. Stanton, counsel for your committee, has informed us that in considering S. 3006, to amend section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 (7 U.S.C. 1854), the question has been raised as to

whether the phrase "any agricultural commodity or product manufactured therefrom" includes timber and its products.

Section 204 is as follows:

"The President may, whenever he determines such action appropriate, negotiate with representatives of foreign governments in an effort to obtain agreements limiting the export from such countries and the importation into the United States of any agricultural commodity or product manufactured therefrom or textiles or textile products, and the President is authorized to issue regulations governing the entry or withdrawal from warehouse of any such commodity, product, textiles, or textile products to carry out any such agreement. Nothing herein shall affect the authority provided under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act (of 1933) as amended (7 U.S.C. 1854)."

Although we have not had time to examine the legislative history of this provision exhaustively, our study thus far indicates that such history does not give clear evidence of the intention of the Congress in this respect. In examining this question, therefore, we believe we must first determine the meaning of this phrase as the words therein have been generally construed.

Webster's New International Dictionary, 2d edition, defines agriculture as "The art or science of cultivating the ground, and raising and harvesting crops, often including also feeding, breeding and management of livestock; tillage; husbandry; farming; in a broader sense, the science and art of the production of plants and animals useful to man, including to a variable extent the preparation of these products for man's use and their disposal by marketing or otherwise. In the broad use it includes farming, horticulture, forestry, dairying, sugarmaking, etc."

Court decisions have adopted the foregoing definition of "agriculture" in defining agricultural commodities and products. *United States v. Turner Turpentine Co.* (111 F. 2d 400 (5th Cir. 1940)) involved the issue of whether labor performed in the production of gum from oleoresin by scarification of living pine trees and its processing into gum spirits of turpentine and gum resin was "agricultural labor" as used in the Social Security Act. The Social Security Act of 1935, as it read before the 1939 amendments, was the law before the court in this case and the term "agricultural labor" was not defined. In holding that Congress intended the term to have a comprehensive meaning so as to include tree products, the court said at page 404:

"When then, Congress in passing an act like the Social Security Act uses, in laying down a broad general policy of exclusion, a term of as general import as 'agricultural labor,' it must be considered that it used the term in a sense and intended it to have a meaning wide enough and broad enough to cover and embrace agricultural labor of any and every kind, as that term is understood in the various sections of the United States where the act operates. This does not mean, of course, that a mere local custom, which is in the face of the meaning of a general term used in an act, may be read into the act to vary its terms. It does mean, however, that when a word or term intended to have general application in an activity as broad as agriculture, has a wide meaning, it must be interpreted broadly enough to embrace in it all the kinds and forms of agriculture practiced where it operates, that its generality reasonably extends to. Definitions of 'agriculture' in standard texts and treatises and in decisions in these latter years have had the widest content. Funk & Wagnalls defines 'agriculture' as including horticulture, fruit raising, etc., 'because agriculture is the science that treats of the cultivation of the soil.' Webster's Unabridged Dictionary, 1935, declares that

in a broader sense agriculture includes farming, horticulture, forestry, dairying, sugarmaking, etc. The Encyclopedia Britannica, 14th edition, 'Forestry as a Science,' declares: 'the science underlying the growing of timber crops is therefore nothing but a branch of general plant science,' while the Cyclopedia of American Agriculture says of forests, 'if agriculture is the raising of products from the land, then forestry is a part of agriculture' (vol. 2, p. 312). From the Encyclopedia Britannica article, on rosin production, we quote the following significant passage: 'The chief region of rosin production is the South Atlantic and Eastern Gulf States of the United States. American rosin is obtained from the turpentine of the swamp pine and of the loblolly pine. The main source of supply in Europe is the lands of the departments of Gironde and Landes in France, where the cluster pine is extensively cultivated.' An examination of the cases cited in 'Words and Phrases,' fifth series, volume 1, page 339 et seq., under agriculture and in 3 C.J.S., 'Agriculture,' pages 361, 365, and 366, section 1, under 'agricultural' and 'agriculture,' convinces that in modern usage this is a wide and comprehensive term and that statutes using it without qualification must be given an equally comprehensive meaning."

The *Turner Turpentine Co.* case was followed in *Stuart v. Kleck* (129 F. 2d 400 (9th Cir. 1942)), which also involved the definition of "agricultural labor" as used in the Social Security Act. In the following cases the courts adopted definitions of "products of the land," "agriculture," "agricultural purposes," "agricultural commodities," "agricultural products," or "agricultural labor," some as used in statutes, in the broad sense of things which are the result of husbandry and the cultivation of the soil (*Sancho v. Bowie*, 93 F. 2d 323 (1st Cir. 1937); *Lowe v. North Dakota Workman's Compensation Bureau*, 220 Wis. 701, 264 N.W. 837 (1936); *Forsythe v. Village of Cooksville*, 356 Ill. 289, 190 N.E. 421 (1934); *In Re Rogers*, 134 Neb. 832, 279 N.W. 800 (1938); *Getty v. C. R. Barnes Milling Co.*, 40 Kan. 281, 19 Pac. 617 (1888); *Florida Industrial Commission v. Growers Equipment Co.*, 152 Fla. 595, 12 So. 2d 889 (1943)).

Congress has recognized that the term "agricultural commodities" may include forest products. Section 207 of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 1091; 7 U.S.C. 1626) defines "agricultural products" to include "agricultural, horticultural, viticultural, and dairy products, livestock and poultry, bees, forest products, fish and shellfish, and any products thereof, including processed and manufactured products, and any and all products raised or produced on farms and any processed and manufactured products thereof."

Section 518 of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (55 Stat. 256; as amended, 7 U.S.C. 1518) defines "agricultural commodity" as "wheat, cotton, flax, corn, dry beans, oats, barley, rye, tobacco, rice, peanuts, soybeans, sugarbeets, sugarcane, timber and forests, potatoes and other vegetables, citrus and other fruits, tame hay."

Section 2 of the act of May 9, 1956 (70 Stat. 133; 12 U.S.C. 1841(g)), concerning bank holding companies, defines "agriculture" to include "farming in all its branches including fruitgrowing, dairying, the raising of livestock, bees, fur-bearing animals, or poultry, forestry or lumbering operations, and the production of naval stores, and operations directly related thereto."

Section 1 of the act of March 4, 1927 (44 Stat. 1423; as amended, 15 U.S.C. 431), concerning discrimination against farmers' cooperative associations by boards of trade, states that "agricultural products" "means agricultural, horticultural, viticultural, and dairy products, food products of livestock,

the products of poultry and bee raising, the edible products of forestry, and any and all products raised or produced on farms and processed or manufactured products thereof, transported or intended to be transported in interstate and/or foreign commerce."

Section 3 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (52 Stat. 1060; as amended, 29 U.S.C. 203(f)), defines "agriculture" to include "farming in all its branches and among other things includes the cultivation and tillage of the soil, dairying, the production, cultivation, growing, and harvesting of any agricultural or horticultural commodities (including commodities defined as agricultural commodities in section 1141j(g) of title 12), the raising of livestock, bees, fur-bearing animals, or poultry, and any practices (including any forestry or lumbering operations) performed by a farmer on a farm as an incident to or in conjunction with such farming operations, including preparation for market, delivery to storage or to market or to carriers for transportation to market."

The present social security tax law, now known as the Federal Unemployment Tax Act, has an extensive definition of "agricultural labor," which includes expressly only some forest products such as naval stores (68A Stat. 447; 26 U.S.C. 3306(k)).

As may be seen, some of the definitions, for the immediate purposes involved in the legislation, include forestry products only in part. However, we believe even in these instances, this serves as an indication that where the terms "agricultural commodities" or "products thereof" are used without qualification it is reasonable to include timber in the concept.

We believe that in the historical development of public attention to the timber resources of this Nation the concept has long been that the growing of trees and the work of forestation and reforestation is a part of agriculture. It also appears to be a necessary corollary that timber is an agricultural commodity and that lumber is a product of such commodity. We have found a number of instances both past and present where this concept is expressed. We will quote a few of these.

In an annual report of the Secretary of the Interior (Ethan Allen Hitchcock) in 1901 the following is stated:¹

"The keynote of the administration of the forest reserves should be to increase the value of the reserves to the public and to perpetuate their forests by wise use * * * Forestry, dealing as it does with a source of wealth produced by the soil, is properly an agricultural subject."

Gifford Pinchot, Chief of the Bureau of Forestry in the Department of Agriculture in 1902, in a statement before the Agricultural Committee of the House, declared:

"Forestry is a component part of agriculture. Every source of wealth grown from the soil is in the sphere of the Department of Agriculture; hence the forest work rightly belongs to it. The production of timber is as naturally within the scope of the Department of Agriculture as is the production of field crops."

Secretary of Agriculture D. F. Houston, in a letter to the chairman of the Public Lands Committee of the Senate, June 24, 1918, stated:

"This Department is charged with the task of stimulating and improving the production of all forms of wealth grown from the soil. A forest is a crop and forestry is primarily a problem of production from the soil."

¹ Some of the following quotations have been derived from a collected document which is authentic. Time has not permitted review of the original sources.

Secretary of Agriculture E. T. Meredith, in an annual report to the President dated November 15, 1921, stated:

"The Bureau of Crop Estimates secures information on the needs of stockmen and farmers for public and national forest ranges which aids the national forest administration, and collects also data on the products of farm woodlots which is of value in the development of farm forestry. In short, having largely exhausted the forest crop grown in advance, the problem now is to use more widely what remains and to grow other crops to meet our needs. That is to say, forestry is a distinctly agricultural business. The function of the Department as a whole includes efforts for the production of the most effective manufacture, distribution, and utilization of the products of both farm and forest for the benefit of the country at large."

President Franklin D. Roosevelt in a letter to the Joint Committee on Forestry of the Congress declared:²

"Forests are intimately tied into our whole social and economic life. They grow on more than one-third the land area of the continental United States. Wages from forest industries support 5 to 6 million people each year. Forests give us building materials and thousands of other things in everyday use. Forest lands furnish food and shelter for much of our remaining game, and healthful recreation for millions of our people. Forests help prevent erosion and floods. They conserve water and regulate its use for navigation, for power, for domestic use, and for irrigation. Woodlands occupy more acreage than any other crop on American farms, and help support 2½ million families.

"Our forest problem is essentially one of land use. It is a part of the broad problem of modern agriculture that is common to every part of the country. Forest lands total some 615 million acres."

In testifying in 1951 on S. 1149, a bill to reorganize the Department of Agriculture, Lyle F. Watts, Chief of the Forest Service, stated:³

"Forestry and grazing are agricultural functions. Trees and grass are crops. Like corn, wheat, and cotton they start from seed. They respond to the same kind of care given other crops. They are harvested—or at least they should be harvested—so that one crop follows another. Their culture is based on the biological sciences, which are chiefly and in many cases exclusively the concern of the Department of Agriculture. Insect and plant-disease control, genetics, soil science, and other agricultural sciences are as important to growing crops of trees and grass as they are to field crops.

"Forestry and grazing are inseparable parts of agriculture. It takes the same know-how to grow timber in the farmer's woods as it does in forests owned by anyone else. Farm woodlands are indispensable to the Nation's timber supply. Farmers own one-third of all our commercial forest land—139 million acres.

"Turning it around, woodlands are indispensable to the farmer. Forest lands make up half the total farm acreage in New England and about 40 percent of all farm acreage in the South. Forest products provide farmers in many regions with a valuable source of cash income. When forest land is properly managed, the timber harvest can be as regular and dependable as any other crop.

"Farm forestry is an integral part of the Department's farm program. Farmers look to the Department of Agriculture for help on farm forestry just as they do in animal husbandry, fruitgrowing, or other crop problems. The small nonfarm forest properties of 125 million acres, almost as extensive as the farm forests and often intermingled with them, face exactly the same problems and should be served by the same agency.

"Nor can any sharp line be drawn between forestry and grazing. In much of the South and West the same land is used to grow both trees and grass. Thus all such lands are interrelated parts of the Nation's agricultural enterprise.

"And from the watershed angle, forest and grazing lands are inseparably linked with field-crop lands. In every watershed, we must have a unified approach covering all lands to effectively control erosion, floods, and water supply. Soil conservation and watershed management are agriculture, and the Department of Agriculture, under the Flood Control Act of 1936, is responsible for watershed surveys on all lands. Within the Department, the Forest Service and the Soil Conservation Service work together closely to reduce damage from floods and sedimentation on forest, grazing, and other croplands.

"Adding it all up, any way you look at it, the answer is the same: Forestry and grazing are agriculture."

It is, therefore, our opinion that forestry is a part of agriculture and that timber is an agricultural commodity. It follows, therefore, that the products thereof, such as lumber, are products within the definition in section 204. We have attempted to analyze the problem from the standpoint of general precedent and authority. If the foregoing analysis is not consistent with the present intent and purposes of the Congress, you may wish to reexamine the question for greater clarification.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN C. BAGWELL,
General Counsel.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. COTTON. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. HRUSKA. First of all, Mr. President, I should like to commend the Senator from New Hampshire for his splendid and eloquent statement concerning the textile industry. I would be the last to discount the importance which he assigns to the textile business. It is, of course, very important to his region of the country insofar as its immediate aspects are concerned, and is important to all of the country in its ultimate aspects. As the Senator from New Hampshire knows, the remarks I have made and the attitude I have assumed are not intended to detract for a second from that fact.

Before I comment further on this matter, and in line with the comments and questions by the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], I should like to say that if there is any question in the mind of anyone that livestock, poultry products, timber, and timber products are embraced in the Mundt amendment, which shortly will be submitted and requested by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], they should read the letter written by Mr. John C. Bagwell, General Counsel of the Department of Agriculture, to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. This letter

points out that Congress on several previous occasions has defined agricultural activity and agricultural products as including these items.

Now we have the question, Are we eligible under section 204 to petition the President for treatment similar to that which he has accorded the textile industry? Yes, we are eligible. All we need is a golden key of some kind, although we do not know just what kind it is.

My principal remarks on the floor yesterday dealt with beef cattle and beef products. Twice that industry petitioned the Tariff Commission and twice it was rebuffed. Why? Because the regular machinery provided for by the tariff laws was so stringent, so hide-bound, and so difficult and complicated, that it was impossible to prove that that industry could qualify.

The President himself has invited the type of amendment which is about to be offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT]. The President says it is almost an anathema to try to ask for piecemeal treatment of tariff legislation and that it cannot be done item by item. He has said that the way to do it is by class. So we have here an amendment dealing with an agricultural class—agricultural products.

All we ask is that agricultural products also be considered by this well-informed President who is so understanding as to economic recessions and wants to get America moving forward again, and who is so full of compassion for all the problems of all the citizens of the United States. All we ask is that this measure include these beleaguered parts of agriculture, which are covered by section 204, and that they be treated with the same beneficence with which he has treated the cotton-textile industry. That is the purpose of the amendment, and I believe it is a very worthwhile purpose. We would greatly regret it if any deleterious effect were to be visited upon the cotton-textile industry. But, at the same time, what better time is there than now—now that the door is slightly ajar—to request such action by the President under section 204. This would not be piecemeal treatment. It would be overall treatment so as to give the beef industry the benefits which he has conferred so generously upon the cotton-textile industry, on whose behalf the Senator from New Hampshire has spoken so eloquently.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, let me say first to my friend, the Senator from Nebraska, that other Members of this body can no doubt more ably and perhaps with even greater enthusiasm represent the President of the United States and can justify whatever may be the action of this administration—and certainly with more knowledge of the subject. But I wish to say to my distinguished friend, now that he has seen fit to ask me this question, that in the case of the textile industry, apparently we are provided with some kind of key; and I believe that key was the fact that the textile industry was in such desperate circumstances. Apparently that key—

² Mar. 14, 1938, Report of the Joint Committee on Forestry, Senate Doc. No. 32, 77th Cong., 1st sess.

³ Hearings before the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, U.S. Senate, 82d Cong., 1st sess., p. 442.

and, by the way, when I say "we," I wish to state that I had nothing to do with it; perhaps the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] had more to do with it—did make it possible to reach the President of the United States, although he has not yet been reached quite far enough, because I regret that woollens and manmade fabrics are no yet included. But the President was reached and was impressed; and he suggested a conference, and it was held; and a temporary agreement was entered into, and now a 5-year agreement has been negotiated.

Now I wish to ask the Senator from Nebraska a question: If he, together with his friends on the other side of the aisle, had been able to find the golden key, and if he had gotten into the White House, and if he had gotten the President of the United States to take action regarding beef and pork and lambs, and if he had in being an agreement, and if he wanted to bring up proposed legislation to solidify the agreement, and if he did so; and if we then jumped up and said, "Wait a minute. You have gotten to the President, but we have not. You have beef covered; and we want to have included also cotton and electronics and boots and shoes from New Hampshire. You have the door ajar, and let us in, too"—would not the distinguished Senator from Nebraska have said then, "Wait a minute, my friend. We have this matter adjusted. We have accomplished this much. Please let us finish this, and please do not encourage all the other Members of the Senate to hang all the cats and dogs they have on top of this much." Would not the Senator take that position under those circumstances?

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, on that score, I did not know that "cats and dogs" are included among agricultural products under section 204. Perhaps they are; perhaps Mr. Bagwell's letter also includes "cats and dogs."

But I do know that section 204 does not include saddles and watches and clocks and hardware implements. It does include agricultural products. I cannot conceive that this would happen because there is not enough gold in our region to fashion a golden key such as that which is in the possession of the advocates of this bill. But, I have an idea that if there were, we would say, "Yes, there is a good deal of merit in the position of those who are asking to be included" and I imagine that our Western generosity and hospitality might extend just a little bit to a situation of that sort.

But I have this proposition to make to the Senator from New Hampshire: Why does not he see to it that we get a chance to extend that generosity and hospitality? If he does, I am sure he will be surprised.

Mr. COTTON. First, Mr. President, let me say that in referring to "cats and dogs," I had no reference whatever to the very worthy commodities included in the Senator's amendment. I merely meant that once the door is opened and once a start is made in adding agricultural commodities to the ones now covered by the bill, an invitation is

extended to also add to the commodities covered by the bill many which may not be strictly agricultural products.

In replying to the Senator's other question, I say to him—and this is all that I can say; and I say it perhaps a little facetiously, but nevertheless sincerely—that if he will only permit us to get this little morsel, which we have obtained for the most needy and desperate industry in the country, nailed down by this bill, I promise him that I will exercise all of the well known and vast influence I have with the President of the United States to do everything within my power to get the President interested in beef and pork—I mean pork on four legs. [Laughter.] And sheep and timber and all the other fine products that mean so much to the people so very well represented by the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one brief observation?

Mr. COTTON. I yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. When a morsel is spoken of in this connection, let me point out that we start with an 8½-cent per pound subsidy, and we talk about international cartels arising. We have statements that the President has said, "Do away with international monopolies; get free trade." Then we have the special depreciation proposal. There is a request held up in the Tariff Commission, and there is held in abeyance a request for an 8½-cent depreciation measure. It seems to me this is more than a morsel—it is more than the traditional half loaf.

Mr. COTTON. I thank the Senator. I hope the people in the textile States will realize what we have done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, some 5 years ago, when I was a member of the Committee on Rules and Administration, it was my pleasure to move the approval of a resolution to create a special subcommittee of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee to investigate the problems of the textile industry of this country. The distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island was chairman of that subcommittee and the distinguished junior Senator from South Carolina and the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire were members.

The subcommittee held hearings in many areas of the United States, and took the statements of those who operated textile mills, those who worked in textile mills, and others who were familiar with every facet of the textile industry. The committee submitted a report with sound recommendations. No committee has ever done a more thorough and outstanding job of inquiring into the problems of any industry and I commend and compliment its members for their efforts.

After years of hard work by those seeking relief for the textile industry, many agencies of our National Government became interested in these problems. The Secretary of Commerce, the Department of State, and finally the President of the United States, as a cul-

mination of the labors of this distinguished group of Senators, worked out an International Textile Agreement among 19 nations producing 90 percent of the world's textiles.

In order to implement this agreement, it is necessary that the Congress pass H.R. 10788. The reason it is necessary is that any country not a party to the international agreement can violate that agreement with impunity, and nothing can be done about it. Among the nations which could violate the agreement are Communist China, Russia, any of the so-called satellite countries, Egypt, Brazil, and the other nations which did not sign the agreement.

The only question for the Senate to resolve now is whether we are going to make an international agreement with 19 nations—Australia, Austria, Canada, Denmark, India, Japan, Norway, Pakistan, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, the United Kingdom, the United States, and member states of the European Economic Community, including Belgium, France, Germany, Italy, Luxembourg, and the Netherlands—that allows a country not a party to it to nullify the fruits of the efforts of our committee, of our Congress and of our national administration.

I have a great admiration for the distinguished Senators from Nebraska, South Dakota, and Colorado, who have seen fit to offer this amendment. I know there are problems involving commodities they seek to help. My own State of Georgia is the largest poultry producing State in the entire United States. We have problems there with our beef and pork industries. But it seems to me to be foolhardy indeed to take the problems of some commodities that have not as yet gone through all the long and strenuous effort that has been involved in getting relief for the textile industry and say to those who are engaged in the manufacture and sale of textiles that, "We are not going to help see your problems solved or remedied in any way unless now we can use this bill as a catchall proposition to solve, at one fell swoop, the problems of the meat industry of this country."

I read the language of one of the amendments that has been offered:

That no agreement in regard to cotton and cotton textiles shall be enforced pursuant to the provisions of this section until such time as the President has negotiated agreements with representatives of foreign nations limiting in like manner the export to the United States from foreign countries of the following commodities—

Then it goes on to name them.

In other words, Mr. President, it is the idea of those sponsoring this amendment that, regardless of what has been done by the Senate Investigating Subcommittee, regardless of what has been accomplished by the Department of Commerce, regardless of what has been accomplished by the State Department, regardless of what has been accomplished by 19 nations, it is to be said, "We are going to stop you cold in your tracks and not let you have a single ounce of remedy or relief unless you also solve all our problems at the same time."

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TALMADGE. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I have before me a copy of the amendment the distinguished Senator read into the RECORD. I note what seems to me to be a peculiar discrimination against cotton and cotton textiles. I ask the distinguished Senator if he notices the same thing; namely, that no agreement as to cotton and cotton textiles should be enforced until after the time when the President has negotiated similar agreements affecting all the other products—that is, beef and beef products, pork and pork products, fresh and frozen lamb, poultry and poultry products, timber and timber products, and dairy products—whereas, as to each of those latter products, an agreement might go into force at once if it were negotiated.

Mr. TALMADGE. The Senator is entirely correct and I would point out to him that no senatorial committee has investigated the problems in connection with beef and beef products, pork and pork products, fresh and frozen lamb, poultry and poultry products, timber and timber products, and dairy products. No international agreements have been obtained with respect to them. Nothing has been done, yet the simple bill now before the Senate to remedy some of the problems in the textile industry, is sought to be used as the basis for the statement, "No; we will not agree to solve any of the problems of the textile industry unless you solve all our problems at the same time."

Mr. President, I am always happy to see any of the problems of the country or the world solved. But I certainly would not say that we must solve each and every problem simultaneously.

I am in sympathy with the desire to solve the problems which concern distinguished Senators, from the Midwest. As a member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I pledge my aid and support in seeking solutions to any of the problems which can be solved, when a case is made individually with respect to each of them. But Senators should not say, "You cannot solve any the textile problems unless you solve all of our problems also."

The subcommittee under the direction of its distinguished and able chairman, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], took hundreds of thousands of words of testimony. It was pointed out therein that textiles are second only to steel in importance to the defense of the Nation. In addition, it was pointed out that since the conclusion of World War II the United States has lost nearly 1 million jobs in the textile industry and that nearly 1,000 textile mills have had to close their doors.

At long last, after much effort and many years of trials and tribulations, some of the recommendations of the distinguished Senator's subcommittee, are beginning to come to fruition, yet some of our colleagues have come to the Senate to offer amendments. They would say to us, "We are going to stop you

cold. You cannot proceed one inch further, unless you solve at the same time every problem relating to the agriculture of our country."

That is indeed a peculiar way to seek to legislate on the floor of the U.S. Senate. Despite my great affection and admiration for this group of distinguished Senators, I hope the amendments will be overwhelmingly rejected, and that the bill which is pending before the Senate will be overwhelmingly approved. Then from time to time we can attempt to solve other problems which may arise in the agricultural area. I pledge, as one Member of the Senate and as one member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to do whatever I can to assist Senators in the solution of those problems.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TALMADGE. I am delighted to yield to my distinguished friend from Nebraska.

Mr. HRUSKA. I am wondering, in reference to section 204 and the exercise of Presidential power thereunder, whether I have been laboring under a misapprehension. It is my recollection and information that no procedures are prescribed by section 204. There are no outlines. There are no standards. Nothing is indicated in the section except a bare exercise of Presidential discretion.

The Senator from Georgia has indicated that there have not been congressional investigations with respect to other agricultural products, such as has been conducted with respect to textiles. I ask the Senator from Georgia whether it is his understanding that it is necessary to have a congressional investigation prior to the time the President can take action under section 204?

Mr. TALMADGE. No; that is not necessary at all. That has been the procedure with reference to the textile bill. This is not something which was done on the Senate floor in one day. This procedure was started the very first year I became a Member of the U.S. Senate, in 1957. An investigating committee was appointed. The committee went throughout the country and took evidence. It came back with recommendations. The bill before the Senate is the culmination of 5 years of work by U.S. Senators.

I suggest to the Senator from Nebraska that the same thing might be done with reference to the problems which the Senator wishes to be covered by the amendment. I know there are problems relating to the importation into this country of certain meat products. I stand ready to help the Senator in any way I can. However, I do not think the Senator ought to say you are trying to solve one great problem, but we are not going to let you solve any problem unless you solve all problems simultaneously.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TALMADGE. I yield now to the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. I say this with full respect for my good colleagues from Nebraska and South Dakota.

The Senator took occasion to mention the golden key. There was nothing mysterious or mystical about the contact with the White House. We have been engaged in this endeavor since 1958. If anyone wishes to classify anything as being a gold key, I would say that the cotton resolution was the key. That is how we started. That was the genesis of what is before the Senate now.

It has been a hard, uphill fight. We were met with a deaf ear in the beginning. We kept at the fight for years. We held hearings and more hearings. We issued our first report February 4, 1959. We issued another report in April 1961. We issued another report in 1962. We kept working on the problem.

We went before the Tariff Commission, too, and we were rejected time and time again. The situation continued to get worse and worse and worse.

Finally we made a recommendation for mandatory quotas, which was rejected. The President suggested, in the seven point program, that possibly we might work out some voluntary quotas. We have done all that.

We have the agreement, but the agreement will become inoperative if we allow other people not party to the agreement to come in through the back door to destroy the effect of the agreement. That is already happening.

If we do not do something now the program will collapse. If we have to wait until the President of the United States takes cognizance of the amendment, until the President calls in all the countries exporting meat products, in which the Senators are so much interested, that cannot be done in a hurry. That may take months and months, years on this problem. By the time all that is done the industry will have died.

That is all we say this afternoon. We know relief is needed in other areas, but we ask Senators not to kill the textile industry off in an endeavor to obtain their desired relief.

Mr. TALMADGE. I thank the distinguished Senator for his very eloquent contribution.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. TALMADGE. I am happy to yield to my friend from Nebraska.

Mr. HRUSKA. It seems to me, Mr. President, that the Senate has under consideration a proposal to grant absolute power to the Chief Executive in the field of agricultural production in this particular respect under section 204.

Now we are asked to broaden that power. As I previously indicated, there is no semblance of any requirement of any kind. There are no standards, no guidelines, no procedures. All we would do would be to throw ourselves upon the mercy of the Nation's conscience which is temporarily represented, as it were, by the present President of the United States. In essence that is what the cotton textile industry has done.

In a different way the other sectors of American agriculture have done the same thing, though perhaps not on such an official plane as in the particular case before us. But I submit that when extended hearings are held before the Tariff Commission, when speeches are

repeatedly made on the floor of the Senate and by the Secretary of Agriculture as to the direct circumstances in which we find other sectors of the agriculture, it is to be presumed that the President of the United States is fully informed on all those questions.

During the 1960 campaign he claimed many times that he was in possession of all the necessary facts showing that agriculture generally, and the sectors to which I refer specifically, were in a critical position. It is not a question of not having the information. He has the information. He himself has said so. His appointed officers from the Cabinet level on down have the information. It seems to us that with this situation and since we have a Chief Executive who has said, "Let us not deal with this subject item by item; let us not do it piecemeal: Let us do it all at one time by categories," we should offer him that opportunity. In fact, we have encouraged him. If he does not want encouragement, let us use a little compulsion so that he will make available to other sectors the benefits of the authority given to him by Congress.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, in reply to the Senator, section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 has already been passed by the Congress. We are not debating that particular issue now. The only question that is before the Senate is whether an international agreement will be made effective and enforceable with respect to nations which are not parties to that agreement.

I am sympathetic with the problems of the distinguished Senator from Nebraska, but he ought not to use the measure now before the Senate as a vehicle to try to prevent any relief for an industry that is badly in need of help. If the Senator complains about trade policies, he will have an adequate opportunity to debate that issue and offer amendments when the trade bill comes before the Senate for action. But the trade bill is not now before the Senate. The only question pending at the present time is that of the implementation of section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956. The question is whether we are to let one or two small countries, or Red China, Russia, or their satellites destroy an agreement that has been made by countries which produce 90 percent of the world's textiles.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TALMADGE. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I do not think I need to tell the distinguished Senator from Nebraska that I am interested in his problems, because his problems in the field we are discussing come much nearer being my problems than is the case with respect to the present issue relating to cotton textiles. There is not a single cotton textile mill in my State, so far as I know, though a small amount of raw cotton is produced in my State.

On the contrary, in Florida there are great numbers of livestock, as the distinguished Senator knows. I think he knows that a citizen of our State is now

president of the National Cattlemen's Association, which would indicate something about the stature of our State in that field.

As to timber and timber products, I think the Senator knows that we are a very large producer in that field.

As to dairy products, poultry and poultry products, and perhaps other products, production in my State of those particular products greatly exceeds our production of cotton. As I have already said, we do not have any cotton textile plants, as is well known to our near neighbor, the distinguished Senator from Georgia.

So the cause of the Senator from Nebraska is our cause on that issue. But I remind him that the effort with respect to textiles has been going on for a long time, as I have had an opportunity to know personally. Before a subcommittee of which I had the honor to be chairman came the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] as chairman of the Subcommittee to Study the Domestic Textile Industry of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

On our subcommittee were not only Senators from this side of the aisle, of which I happened to be one, but from the other side of the aisle there were the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], who was the ranking minority member, and the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], who was also a minority member of that subcommittee. When the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] came before us, we unanimously agreed that this was a field that badly needed help—so badly that we not only gave our assistance in establishing a special study commission, but also, we provided money in the bill, before the commission was actually created, as I recall.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for an observation?

Mr. TALMADGE. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island, so that he may carry on a colloquy between himself and the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PASTORE. There was abundant proof before our committee that the textile industry, particularly with relation to woolsens and worsteds, had deteriorated so much in the past decade that, God forbid, if we were to have another world war we would not have facilities in the United States to put the necessary cloth on the backs of our soldiers. That is how serious the situation is. That is the reason we have gone this far. That is the reason we are as enthusiastic and as vigorous as we are in the present campaign.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island for his comment, which is true.

In the subcommittee we found abundant reason for bipartisan action. That was the finding later, in the full Committee on Appropriations. Later this

particular bill, or others similar to it, came before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, another committee of which I am a member, and of which the distinguished Senator from Georgia is also a member. As I recall, the measure was reported from that committee unanimously because we knew that textiles and the cotton industry were in a serious condition.

Mr. President, I assure my good friend from Nebraska that I will help in any way I can to attain the objectives which he has in mind. I give the same assurance to my distinguished friend from South Dakota, who is also a member of that committee. In helping them, I shall be helping myself in my own State, because it has problems in that field.

There is now before the Senate a measure, ready for action, under which the temporary agreement would not expire until October, and the permanent agreement would then come into force. It is proposed by the amendment that no action be taken either in support of the temporary agreement or in support of the permanent one, which would come into effect in October, until other fields of agricultural production are served by the same kind of agreements, arrived at on an international basis with various groups of nations.

Those nations are not the same nations which are engaged in the textile industry. They are not the same nations that are engaged in the production of beef, lambs, timber, or the other products that have been mentioned.

I believe upon further consideration my distinguished friend will realize that this is not the time and place to raise the question as to what should be our permanent policy on this question. We have no one to negotiate these questions but the President. When a distinguished member of the party on the other side of the aisle was the President, we were for the measure, as we are now. We received sympathetic consideration and help from President Eisenhower. There has been an extension and continuation of that sympathy and help from the President now presiding over our Nation.

The issue is not a partisan or regional one, but it is a matter of very great importance to this Nation, which is now seeking to renew its prosperity, to employ people who have been discharged, and to make prosperous businesses which have languished for many years.

Mr. President, I hope that my distinguished friends will not insist upon their amendment, because upon further consideration, I believe they will realize that they would make of cotton textiles the most discriminated-against group in the whole category of the agricultural producing industry, in that it would provide that until each of these other industries, and every one of them, had been served by a similar agreement, the cotton textile industry, which has acted first, and which, I believe, was most cruelly affected by the situation which we have lived through, could not have any relief; whereas each of these

other industries would have the relief, provided under their amendment just as quickly as an agreement in the particular industry had been worked out.

I do not believe my distinguished friends want to discriminate in that way against the diligence and against the industriousness of those who have been hurt the worst during the lack of prosperity through which we have passed in that industry, and which has been a calamitous blow to the prosperity of many States.

My own feeling is that we should very promptly pass the bill and allow the President by appropriate action to prevent a few recalcitrant nations from wrecking the common effort of ourselves with 18 other nations, comprising among the 19 of us the producers of about 90 percent of the textiles of the world. Can we say that the remaining few nations, producing about 10 percent of the textiles, should be permitted, by diverting disproportionate amounts of their production, to wreck a program so beneficent in its purpose and so completely important to a large segment of our Nation and to many great States? I do not believe my distinguished friends would want to be in that position. I respectfully request them to withdraw and not insist upon a consideration of their amendment or the adoption of their amendment.

I thank my distinguished friend from Georgia.

Mr. TALMADGE. I thank the Senator from Florida. He has succinctly summarized the situation which confronts the Senate at the present time. Being a Senator from a State producing every one of the items referred to in the amendment, I know something about the problems of the meat industry and the producers of meat products.

I say, in conclusion, that I certainly stand willing to do what I can to help solve the problems of the meat industry. However, I do not believe that we ought to wreck a partial solution of the textile problem because totally unrelated problems are not being solved simultaneously.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to speak very briefly on this subject. I agree completely with what the Senator from Florida has said. The purpose of the bill is to make effective what the President has done in a multilateral agreement. The multilateral agreement came about from an effort to have bilateral agreements effected. When 90 percent of the imports come from these 19 countries which are covered by the multilateral agreement, that effort will not be effective unless an amendment to the act of this character is adopted. The other 10 percent, which will come from countries that are not in the multilateral agreement, are permitted to bring about imports that will make ineffective the multilateral agreement.

It means much to us in New England in the textile industry. It means much to us when this cotton processed for countries abroad is going abroad at lower prices than our textile mills have to pay here.

Therefore, I hope the bill will be passed and that the amendment sponsored by our friends from the Middle West will not be offered or, if it is offered, will be voted down.

I personally have no objection and no criticism of the efforts being made on the part of these other industries, the cattle industry, or the pig industry, or any other industry, if and when the proper time comes for such an amendment to be offered. However, certainly those industries are not in the same position as is the cotton textile industry at the present time. So, therefore, Mr. President, if the amendment is adopted it will eliminate the possibility of the President carrying out what he has undertaken to do by this multilateral agreement. Therefore, I hope that the amendment of the Senators from Nebraska and South Dakota will not be offered; but if it is offered, I hope it will be voted down.

I can assure them that at the proper time and when the circumstances are ripe, they will have a friend in me, if the circumstances are the same as they are in the textile industry today. We want to preserve the textile industry in New England and in the South and in other parts of the country. We want to build it up. The multilateral agreement which the President has made means a great deal to the cotton textile industry in the various States of the Nation.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment identified as 5-15-62—A, offered on behalf of myself and the Senators from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA and Mr. CURTIS], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT].

I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be not read but may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the amendment was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On page 1, line 12, strike out the period and quotation marks, insert a colon, and add the following: "Provided, however, That no agreement in regard to cotton and cotton textiles shall be enforced pursuant to the provisions of this section until such time as the President has negotiated agreements with representatives of foreign nations limiting in like manner the export to the United States from foreign countries of the following commodities: Beef and beef products, pork and pork products, fresh and frozen lamb, poultry and poultry products, timber and timber products, and dairy products."

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, as one who represents a great agricultural State, let me say, first of all, that I am pleased by the assurance of Senatorial support for the position which has been advanced by those of us who have cosponsored the amendment. While understandably the sponsors of the bill disagree with us concerning the matter of timing, I am happy to receive the pledges of support which have been enunciated on the floor, and hope that they will grow and grow in number until we have solved the very serious problems confronting other segments of the agricultural industry, in addition to cotton.

Mr. President, one of the first lessons anyone learns in this fascinating business of legislating is that one must legislate when the opportunity presents itself. One learns very early in this game that if he lets the bus go by and then tries to legislate with nothing but the tail lights staring him in the eye he very frequently never has another opportunity to come to the rescue of his constituents who are in difficulty.

It is true that the cotton textile industry is in difficulty. I sympathize with the problems with which that industry is confronted, I want to be helpful to it. I attended some of the hearings that were held under the able leadership of the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE]. At that time the committee members were discussing imports wool and manmade fabrics and synthetics and silk in one big, common approach along with cotton to protect the textile industry. However, somewhere along the line their goals have become smaller and more remote. In all events, they now have no place in their approach for any help for great segments of our agricultural industry which are covered in the original section 204 of the act, and for which the very same procedures we are discussing here were designed for utilization in the protection of other segments of our great economy.

The amendment which we have offered would provide to all the farmers of the country the same benefits which would accrue from the proposed legislation only to cotton producers and cotton textile manufacturers. It has long been my understanding that when we legislate in Congress, we should try to legislate in such a manner as to keep in mind the national problems as a whole, and to provide equal protection to people who are suffering from similar problems; and that only on rare and disappointing occasions do we legislate for a favored few, when we have the opportunity to legislate for all.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield, without losing his right to the floor?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield with that understanding.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, after consultation with the distinguished minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN]; the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the author of the amendment; Senators who have joined with him in offering it; and other interested Senators, I am prepared to submit a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, first, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The proposed unanimous-consent agreement will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That, effective on Thursday, May 17, 1962, at the conclusion of routine morning business, during the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 10788) to amend section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956, debate on the proposed amendment by Senator MUNDT, numbered 5-15-62—A, and all amendments thereto be terminated at 2:30 p.m., to be equally divided and controlled by Senators MUNDT and ELLENDER: *Provided further*, That no amendment that is not germane, unless to introduce a new commodity, to the provisions of the said bill shall be received.

Ordered further, That on the question of the final passage of the said bill, debate shall be limited to 30 minutes, to be equally divided and controlled respectively by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I ask the distinguished majority leader whether under the proposed unanimous-consent agreement I might have the opportunity to offer an amendment? I may wish to do so; I am not sure yet that I shall. I desire to elicit some information before doing so.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The proposed unanimous-consent agreement was offered with the assurance that only the one amendment would be considered. However, I am prepared, if the Senator from South Dakota and Senators who have cosponsored his amendment are agreeable, to allocate one-half hour within the time until 2:30 for the offering of any other amendment. I am about to ask unanimous consent that the Senate convene at 11 a.m., instead of 12 o'clock noon, tomorrow.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, several Senators who are not now in the Chamber have indicated an interest in speaking on the amendment; and furthermore, the time being allotted is being cut pretty thin.

Would it not be better to allocate an extra half hour, if necessary, from the hour to be set aside for the consideration of the bill?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if that is agreeable to the Senator from Iowa, I make that modification in the proposed unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. MILLER. That is entirely agreeable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the proposed unanimous-consent agreement, as modified, is agreed to.

(The unanimous-consent agreement was subsequently reduced to writing, as follows:)

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That, effective on Thursday, May 17, 1962, at the conclusion of routine morning business, during the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 10788) to amend section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956, debate on the proposed amendment by Senator MUNDT, numbered 5-15-62—A, and all amendments thereto be terminated at 2:30 p.m., to be equally divided and controlled by Senators MUNDT and ELLENDER. *Provided*, That debate

on an amendment to be offered by Senator MILLER to the bill be limited to 30 minutes to be equally divided between Senators MILLER and ELLENDER. *Provided further*, That no amendment that is not germane, unless to introduce a new commodity, to the provisions of the said bill shall be received.

Ordered further, That on the question of final passage of the said bill, debate shall be limited to 30 minutes, to be equally divided and controlled respectively by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the quorum call under rule XII, which would take place at 2:30 p.m., be omitted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, if the Senate is to convene at 11 o'clock tomorrow morning, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be permitted to sit during the session of the Senate.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, does that request include subcommittees of the Committee on the Judiciary?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am thinking only of the Committee on the Judiciary, because technically the wiretapping bill is before the full committee.

Mr. KEATING. I am sure that if he were in the Chamber, the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd], who has scheduled hearings dealing with narcotics before the Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency, would wish to have extended to his subcommittee the privilege of sitting during the session of the Senate tomorrow. Could such a request be included?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I make that request, as well.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, does not the request of the Senator from Illinois imply that if it is granted, an additional hour will be provided for the debate covered by the preceding unanimous-consent request?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No; my request is wholly independent of the unanimous-consent request. It is a plain request for the Committee on the Judiciary to meet, notwithstanding the session of the Senate tomorrow morning.

Mr. HOLLAND. I understood the request of the Senator from Illinois to include having the Senate convene at 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

Mr. DIRKSEN. No; I merely said, "if the Senate is to convene at 11 o'clock tomorrow morning"; and that request has not been acted upon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet tomorrow morning during the session of the Senate.

ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL 11 O'CLOCK A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business this eve-

ning, it take a recess until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CHANGE IN ORDER FOR CALL OF CALENDAR TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the previous unanimous-consent agreement, providing for the Senate to proceed to the consideration of unobjected-to measures on the calendar at the conclusion of the morning hour, be changed to provide for their consideration in the period following the disposition of the pending bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield for a question?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. How late does the Senator from Montana expect the session today to continue?

Mr. MANSFIELD. No votes will be taken tonight. So it will be up to the Members of the Senate to decide how long they wish to speak and to have the session continue.

AMENDMENT OF THE AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10788) to amend section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, a moment ago I was endeavoring to state that in my opinion agricultural legislation and all other legislation generally should be designed to take care of as many Americans as possible who suffer from identical problems; and I believe we should move very slowly in the direction of establishing precedents to take care of certain select groups at a time when other groups have the same or similar problems and at a time when other groups, if not relieved by such legislation, may never obtain the relief to which they are entitled.

I know that in the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry we frequently try to deal with the various farm problems and to legislate in such a way that legislation good for the farmers in one part of the country will also be good for the farmers in other areas; and we are always completely disinclined to play off one segment of agriculture against another.

Mr. President, the pending bill is good as far as it goes, and I am inclined to support it because it helps solve a problem which exists in one area of the country. But the bill does not go far enough, because it is blind to other problems which confront agriculture in other areas of the country.

Bluntly stated, the pending bill is special legislation for the benefit of the cotton-textile industry. The bill is designed to meet the problems of that industry; and if that industry were the only one in the country which had similar problems, I would say the bill would constitute good legislation. But when other producers and other processors in

the country are confronted with the same problem, it seems to me the Senate should use its collective judgment to try to secure for all the relief which this measure would provide for only some.

Recently, in the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, we concluded the writing of the highly contested and rather complicated so-called omnibus farm bill. In it we have tried to include provisions which will be of benefit to a great many different segments of the economy. Even the urbanites are taken care of in the bill, because it provides for improved recreational opportunities and better uses of farm land in which urbanites can have direct benefit. In that measure we did not single out one segment of agriculture and try to correct only its problems while we were confronted with identical problems applicable to other areas.

Therefore, I think the type of amendment which we have proposed in this case—an amendment which simply would deal with all the agricultural activities and problems which stem from the same source, namely, surplus commodities coming from abroad—is a good one, for I sincerely believe that good legislation is legislation for the benefit of all, not for the benefit of only a few.

So our amendment deals with beef producers and beef processors who suffer from the same problem as that from which the cotton producers and cotton processors and the textile industry suffer; and the amendment deals also with the pork producers, the poultry producers, and especially with the lamb producers and processors, who are the victims of an even greater attack from imports, as compared with that suffered by the textile industry.

Likewise, the amendment includes the dairy industry, which is in a serious plight, and needs assistance, and suffers from direct competition from imports—just as do cotton and its products.

So, Mr. President, we proposed to make the benefits of such protection available both to cotton producers and to the producers of beef, the producers of pork, the producers of timber, and the producers of poultry and poultry products and dairy products. We would extend the same protection benefits to both the cotton producers of the South and the dairy producers of Wisconsin, Minnesota, Michigan, upstate New York, the Dakotas, and elsewhere, because the reasoning for such provisions is foursquare with the reasoning which rightfully has been advanced in connection with the bill as it now stands. In other words, we would expand the bill, so as to have it apply fairly to all, instead of to only a few.

By the adoption of our amendment, we would finally find a way to stop the importation of hams from Communist Poland, for example—for the administration continues to permit the importation of hams from that Communist country, and those importations result in driving down the price of the hams and pork products produced by U.S. farmers. By means of our amendment we would increase the protection applicable to competitive imports which are damaging

the U.S. beef industry and the U.S. sheep industry.

Legislation of this kind, which has been worked out for the benefit of cotton and the cotton-textile industry, would work with equal certainty for the benefit of these other products. In my opinion, we should not engage in writing favoritism into congressional legislation. I think such special favoritism legislation is especially unhappy when it is applied to the field of agriculture, because these days we are reading in the daily newspapers about altogether too much favoritism being manifest in agricultural workers.

Clearly, Mr. President, there are a series of problems, similar in nature and identical in cause, which can be eliminated by means of the same solution. So why should the bill be limited to cotton textiles, when we have an opportunity to include the rest?

It may be argued that cotton textiles are in serious condition. I know they are, and I think they need some legislation. But, in my opinion, the "rescue squad" is rushing in and is attempting to have this bill passed now, for fear that the pending tariff legislation, proposed from the White House, is going to make a bad situation even worse for the rest—and well it might. In fact, if those of us who are concerned with other agricultural products were to let that happen—let the cotton and the cotton-textile industries completely clog the escape hatch, so that no one else could get out—I am afraid that would increase the likelihood of the passage of an obnoxious tariff bill which then would do great harm and great damage to all segments of the agricultural industry except this particular one, which then would be "sitting on cloud nine"—I refer to the cotton and the cotton-textile industry—and when looking down on the others, would be saying, "We got ours while the getting was good. Now we are 'out from under'; but you are still there, and we sympathize with you."

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Is there any reason, in the name of a sense of fair play and equality, why all other commodities should not be given treatment equal to cotton and textiles?

Mr. MUNDT. If there is, the Senator from South Dakota has not heard it on the floor of the Senate. Although he has heard eloquent speeches on behalf of textiles, he has not heard any argument why one group should be so treated and the other should have to suffer from competition with the rest of the world.

Mr. DWORSHAK. This proposal is designed primarily to have political appeal in an election year. Would not that same appeal be effective in areas outside of those which are interested in cotton and textiles?

Mr. MUNDT. I am not sure I understand the Senator's question. I do not believe the proposal to provide protection for the cotton and textile industry against the President's new tariff plan and program is politically inspired. I think it is economically inspired. I

think they are suffering from an economic situation. I think they recognize that, unless they are excluded out, they will be included in the President's new tariff proposal, and if so they can be hurt even worse than they are. But it seems to me that, in view of the curious, strange concessions made by the White House for the producers of cotton and textiles, which are denied the beef and lamb industry and poultrymen and dairymen and those raising timber and those who are engaged in timber products, there might be some connection between that action and the hope in the mind of someone at the other end of the avenue that if they take care of the cotton and textile group, they will have more chance to have the administration's tariff legislation passed.

Mr. DWORSHAK. That action is essentially discriminatory and provides preferential treatment to that economic group.

Mr. MUNDT. There is no question about that. When there are a whole series of economic groups with the same problems in the same oversea locations and an effort is made to solve one group and not the others, that is discrimination. I think even Mr. Freeman would call that favoritism. It seeks to help the favored few, and not those who do not have the entree required in the proper places to get the right thing done to solve their problem.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. MUSKIE. Purely for my information in filling in the background of the Senator's amendment, I wish to ask the Senator a question. The Senator has said this same relief has been denied the people whose cause he is pleading now. Did he mean that? Did they apply for and were they denied the same treatment now being offered to the textile people?

Mr. MUNDT. Yes. I do not want to say in the same words. They have appeared before Congress, the President, and the Tariff Commission. They have sent delegations down here trying to get protection against excessive foreign imports, and they have been denied that relief; and now the cotton and textile people are going to get it.

Mr. MUSKIE. Specifically with respect to this kind of relief, negotiations with exporting countries, has there been an effort to get that kind of relief for the people the Senator represents this afternoon? I do not ask that question in any sense except for information.

Mr. MUNDT. I would not be able to speak for all segments of the agricultural economy which we cover in this measure. The effort has certainly been made in the dairy industry with respect to cheese. As a matter of fact, a voluntary bilateral agreement has been entered into with regard to cheese. It is not identical and not exactly foursquare, but the same approach, the same protest, the same area of statistics have been presented to the Congress, the President, and the Tariff Commission. They may not have come up with the same solution, but the relief has been denied, the

same relief which is being granted the cotton and textile people.

Mr. MUSKIE. In order that the Senator may understand my position, I think this relief is sensible relief. I think it ought to be granted to other industries that have suffered the same kind of injury or that risk the same kind of injury. Later this afternoon I am going to have something to say on that subject. I wanted it clear for the record what my view was so far as this industry is concerned.

Mr. MUNDT. I am glad the Senator is interested in the matter. I do not think the Senator would have to search very hard to learn—perhaps he may have learned it already—that in the State of Maine producers of other materials besides the textile industry are greatly concerned about importations.

Mr. MUSKIE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MUNDT. We must try to find a solution.

What happens after this? We are later going to have a chance to vote on a tariff proposal which takes Congress out of the picture and gives the President of the United States the right to determine what is to be done, if we follow his request for tariff power. He has said we will get it done quicker this way. We are asked to give the President the right to establish, abolish, or impose tariffs.

So we make this proposal while we still have jurisdiction over the problem. I hope we will be able to continue it, but I am afraid, with the pressures on, that this body may succumb and turn over to the President the right to write tariff legislation. On this particular day we still have that power.

I say to my good friends from the South, who very persuasively argue, "We have our problem solved. Do not muddy up the water. We will be glad to help you later on, tomorrow, maybe," sometimes, in this legislative business, tomorrow never comes; and it is never, never, never going to come if we turn over our powers to legislate on tariffs to the White House, and our appeals are not going to be any more fruitful from the standpoint of protecting the beef producers and lamb producers and poultry producers and timber producers and dairy producers in the future than they have been in the past.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. May I not draw the Senator's attention to the fact that we do not have to wait for the proposed new Trade Agreements Act to come before this body to be asked to delegate our legislative powers to the President? We have that proposal before us right now in the very language of the bill now pending.

Mr. MUNDT. To what is the Senator referring?

Mr. MILLER. I am referring to H.R. 10788, to which the Senator from South Dakota has proposed an amendment, which states:

The President may also issue, in order to carry out such an agreement, regulations governing the entry or withdrawal from warehouse of the same article which are

the products of countries not parties to the agreements.

There is nothing in the proposed act that I can see which has any legislative restraint whatsoever on the issuance of those regulations. Am I correct?

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator is correct to that extent, yes; but I think that is a small delegation of authority compared to the complete capitulation of our control over tariff legislation which is proposed.

Mr. MILLER. May I call attention to the fact that under section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956, the agreements under GATT, both the 1-year and 5-year agreements, apparently could have gone beyond merely textiles. Under section 204, which former President Eisenhower saw fit to disdain to use, Congress already has given the President sweeping authority and power to negotiate agreements.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator is correct, and of course, the purpose of my amendment is to mandate the President to exercise those sweeping powers for other segments of the economy, which, because of the culmination of circumstances and evidence and motivations, have caused him to act for cotton and textiles.

Mr. MILLER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the question arises: Are only the cotton and textile industries in difficulty? If so, certainly the Senate would be justified in passing the proposed legislation, because it would be helpful, and it would be justified in doing so without bringing in extraneous matters.

However, the advocates of the proposal before the Senate, and the opponents of my amendment, argue that they already have shut off 90 percent of the export cotton which comes to this country by the agreements which have been voluntarily entered into. They are concerned about 10 percent of the total imports.

When one starts to manifest the kind of concern demonstrated for 10 percent of the total imports, which is what would be done if the Senate were to pass the proposed legislation, I submit that every one of the other agricultural products named would be endangered to a greater extent than 10 percent of the total imports, which would be involved in respect to the proposed legislation now before the Senate.

The proponents themselves admit that the 19 countries produce 90 percent of the imports. They are worried about 10 percent which is coming in from those countries not covered. They wish to make those countries conform.

I think that makes good sense. I understand their motivation. I point out, however, that the economic problem, compared to that of other segments of American industry, is certainly no worse.

Let me illustrate some of the other problems. At the present time there are annual quotas on imports coming in in the dairy industry.

Butter, 707,000 pounds.

Butter oil, 1.2 million pounds.

Malted milk, 6,000 pounds.

Dried whole milk, 7,000 pounds.

Nonfat dried milk, 1,807,000 pounds.

Cheddar cheese, 2,780,100 pounds.

Blue mold cheese, 5,017,000 pounds.

These are the figures, even after the quotas have been established under section 22 of the Agricultural Act.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. MUSKIE. As a point of clarification, the textile agreements in question involve countries which export 90 percent of the world's cotton textiles. The Senator is correct on that point.

The purpose of the bill, however, is not merely to give the President power to apply the same restrictions to the countries producing the other 10 percent. The purpose is to avoid, by passage of the bill, the giving to the 10-percent countries an advantage over the 90-percent countries, to the point that the agreement with the 90-percent countries would be vitiated. In other words, without passage of the bill, the danger is that the rug will be pulled out from under the agreement with the 90-percent countries, so we are concerned not only with the 10-percent countries but also with all the countries, in the firm belief that they would feel themselves not bound if we could not deal in a similar fashion with the 10-percent countries.

Mr. MUNDT. I think the Senator is correct. As I said, I think the effort is wise, prudent and proper. The fact still remains that it is motivated by the fact that 10 percent of the total foreign imports are not covered without the kind of legislation which the proponents have in mind. It is my argument that the 10 percent does not represent as large an import threat to the cotton industry per se as is represented by the imports of all the other farm commodities which, those of us associated with the amendment have mentioned.

I have mentioned the commodities brought in from the standpoint of dairy production on an annual basis. We are in that situation at a time when the Commodity Credit Corporation report for March 31, 1962, the most recent report, points out that the United States is now surfeited with a surplus of dairy products which are stored by the Commodity Credit Corporation, on which the taxpayer must pay a high storage price. We are still importing products to be pyramided on the products in surplus, produced at home, to further force down the prices the dairy producer receives for his milk on the farm.

I quote from schedule 12 of the March 31, 1962, report of the Commodity Credit Corporation, which states that there are in storage 271,040,979 pounds of butter, with a total value of over \$163 million; 67,011,196 pounds of cheese, with a total value of over \$25 million; and 425,091,846 pounds of dried milk, with a total value of over \$71 million.

The United States is importing dairy products, when the Commodity Credit Corporation has a surplus of those products of that magnitude, on which the taxpayers must pay storage fees out of their pockets. I submit that at such a time it should be wise legislation to pro-

vide the same corrective and the same cure against imports of that kind as it is proposed to provide in respect to the cotton and textile industry by the proposed legislation now before the Senate.

So much with respect to dairy products. Let us look at some of the other products which would be included in the proposed legislation.

The timber industry, Mr. President, is in a serious fix in this country precisely for the same reason that the textile mills are in a serious fix and the same reason that the cotton producers are in a serious fix.

One cannot keep men employed in a timber mill if the Nation is getting all of its timber from a foreign country, any more than one can keep people employed in a textile mill in Maine or in New Hampshire if the Nation is buying all its textiles from Japan or some other country.

We can see what is happening. I have a report prepared by the National Lumber Manufacturers' Association, as presented in the statement made before the Senate Committee on Commerce on the American lumber import problem, April 16, 1962. This industry has taken the same steps as the cotton industry. It has come to the Congress for assistance. It has gone to the Tariff Commission for assistance. It has gone to the White House for assistance.

Somehow this industry must not have had the right knuckles knocking on the right door, because it has not gotten as far as the cotton people have.

I congratulate the cotton people for the start they have made, and I submit that a formula which is helpful to them will be equally helpful to the timber industry and to other industries. I see no good reason why we should seek to benefit only some and to continue to do injury to the others.

Let us see what is stated in the report by the National Lumber Manufacturers' Association of April 16. I quote from page 2:

In 1961 alone there was an increase of 400 million board feet in softwood lumber imports from Canada. In the 13-year period 1949 to 1961 Canada increased her lumber shipments to the United States by approximately 186 percent.

If we are talking about the severity of the problem and if we are talking about the perils to a domestic industry, though I do not know what are the percentages with respect to the increase in imports of cotton and of textiles, I doubt that the percentages would be more excessive than a 186 percent increase in the same period of time.

In 1949 Canada supplied 5.2 percent of the U.S. consumption of softwood lumber. Last year she supplied approximately 14 percent.

On April 6 of this year the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the U.S. Department of Labor advised that there are more than 200,000 men and women formerly employed in the lumber and wood products industries now drawing unemployment compensation in America. Let me emphasize—this figure does not include unemployment in the retail and wholesale trade.

The report is replete with startling information of that kind. It demonstrates that the timber and timber products in-

dustry, along with the dairy industry and other industries included in the amendment, suffer from identically the same problem, sometimes with a great degree of severity, created from the same foreign sources, yet the great Senate of the United States proposes to help only the cotton producer and to do nothing about the other industries.

The Senators from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA and Mr. CURTIS], my colleague [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], and I feel that legislation should have a broader horizon and a wider purpose than that, and the time to legislate on that kind of problem is when the problem is before us. Certainly the time to legislate is before we capitulate to the Executive, and surrender our right to legislate at all in the great, broad traditional field of tariff legislation, as the President seriously proposes in the measure now before the committees of this very body.

I would be terribly disappointed if any of the Senators who are going to vote to create a cotton escape hatch would vote later in the session to delegate to the White House complete control over the tariff economy of this country, so that never again would they be able to cast a protective vote for textiles, cotton, or anything else. I hope that when they cast their votes in support of cotton tomorrow at 2:30 p.m. it will not be their swan song as far as protecting their constituents in the textile and cotton industry is concerned. I hope that when they vote "yes" to protect cotton, they will not at the same time say, "Good-by, chum. We are voting away our authority so we can never, never help you again."

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. It is proposed that the Presidential power be exercised in the present instance to alleviate the troubles of the textile industry. All of us agree that the industry has troubles which are serious; in fact, they threaten its very life. We are all aware of that. But there is grave doubt as to whether the power vested in the President by section 204 should be allowed to reside in the President because it is so unrestricted. It is the recollection of the Senator from Nebraska that during considerable discussion in the other body, that statutory authority—unbridled, unrestricted, and unlimited as it is—was attacked as being an improper authority for the very reasons which the Senator from South Dakota has just recited.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator is exactly correct. I appreciate his contribution to the present colloquy. I wish also to call the attention of all who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and especially my friends in the Senate who will be voting on the issue tomorrow, to the very persuasive, convincing, erudite, and important speech delivered on the subject by the distinguished Senator from Nebraska that appears in yesterday's RECORD at the end of the day's proceedings. It seems to me that he put the whole argument clearly, cogently, and convincingly, and demonstrated why the Senate should be concerned about

the problems of all interested in raw products in this country who are suffering from foreign imports, and not neglect all but the cotton people, as we come to legislate on the subject.

Mr. President, out in the great West some of the best timber ever to grow in God's great out-of-doors is raised. In that country is the Simpson Timber Co., with which I have had some correspondence. The Simpson Timber Co. is one of those enlightened timber companies that consider forestry a system of cropping. Great Douglas-firs are planted many, many years before they finally mature. As some of the trees are cut down in one part of the forest, the company repopulates the forest so that never again will we have a denuded area in such places. That is an enlightened, progressive, and successful timber country.

I had the privilege at one time of going through some of the lumber mills. I spent a day at the logging camp. I contemplated the manner in which a great timber crop is produced. As a consequence, I have had some correspondence with that company on the very subject which we are now discussing. First, I shall quote from a letter from the Simpson Timber Co. dated February 9:

This report—

Which they enclose—
demonstrates that BC—

I am sure the writer refers to British Columbia—

is leading west coast shipments by 200 million board feet, giving BC control of this important American lumber market for the first time in American history. This difference in wages of loggers and sawmill men alone, not to mention all other economic factors, represents an annual payroll loss to west coast sawmill communities of \$10 million.

I thanked the writer for that earlier information.

On February 28 they sent along some more. In that letter they said:

The Pacific Lumber Inspection Bureau January 1962 report of water-borne lumber shipments to the Atlantic seaboard from British Columbia and west coast mills reveals that the Canadians set a new all-time high by taking 71.4 percent of the market, which until 1961 always had been held by west coast mills.

I call that testimony to the attention of Senators who represent Oregon, Idaho, Washington, and upper California. That is a beautiful, gorgeous scenic area, which also finds its people having to work for a living, many of them in the saw mills and in the forests of the area. Senators from that area will have an opportunity tomorrow to strike a blow in defense of a great and growing industry in the Northwest. It may be in the last opportunity which they as Senators will have to strike that blow if Congress loses its authority over tariff legislation.

The letter of February 28th continues:

In January British Columbia shipped to this market—

The Atlantic seaboard market—

101,006,759 board feet. Washington and Oregon shipped 40,443,828 board feet.

The portion shipped by British Columbia was 71.4 percent; the percentage shipped by Washington and Oregon was 26.6 percent.

In summation, the amendment which a number of us have coauthored, and upon which we shall vote tomorrow, can correct that kind of sorry situation.

I wish to speak a word about livestock, because livestock and poultry are in this business in the same way that cotton, textiles, and other products which I have been discussing are. We are continuing to import live cattle and meat imports at a greater rate than we did a year ago.

The carcass weight equivalent of cattle imported last year set a new record of 1,300 million pounds. The carcass weight equivalent of lamb and mutton imported last year was up from 1960, but not quite equal to the record imports of 1959.

The material to which I am referring comes from the Livestock and Meat Situation, published by the Economic Research Service of the Department of Agriculture, in its May 1962, report.

Referring to the same report, in the first quarter of this year the number of cattle imported was down from the high rate maintained during the fourth quarter of 1961, but was up almost 28 percent over the 220,000 head imported in the first quarter of 1961. So, comparing like quarters of a year ago, the imports are up 220,000 head.

Mr. President, it is not my purpose to labor the record with statistics on sheep, lamb, cotton, poultry, and eggs. They are all available. The statistics I put in the RECORD are merely intended to point out that those various segments of our agriculture economy face the same problem. The problem comes from the same fact, failure to protect those segments from foreign imports, which is the genesis of the proposed legislation now before us that the cotton and the textile people have been working on constructively and long, because there has been a failure to protect them against excessive imports.

I am unable to answer the question that was asked of me earlier on the floor this afternoon: What reason is there why we should be so diligent in solving the cotton problem, and be so negligent about doing something for the rest of the farm economy?

If we fail now, when will we have another chance? If we fail now, will we ever have another chance? That is a question that I suspect will have to be answered seriously by the Senators who vote against our amendment in an effort to cause us to fail now. That is not a question that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] and I will have to answer, because we will grab time by the forelock and do what we can, when we can, as we can, to treat the various segments of our agriculture economy alike.

Mr. President, I do not blame our southern friends and those associated with them, in the textile industry in New England, for making their fight in behalf of their constituents. We expect them to do that. However, it seems to me that in the longrun they would do much better to associate themselves with a set

of economic principles and policies which apply to all segments of our economy equally, instead of taking advantage of a fortuitous circumstance which enables them now, with White House approval, to get special consideration for a privileged group by special legislation.

I believe that in the long run they would do better to join with us, who suffer from the same problem, although we do not happen to be situated in the same fortuitous circumstances in which they find themselves, but who, in the long pull, will have to work with those who suffer from ruinous foreign imports.

It is hard to square this proposed legislation, as the Senator from Nebraska has pointed out, with the high-sounding pronouncements on unrestricted trade and international exchange which are now issuing from the White House, as a part of the plea to Congress to step down from its constitutional role of legislating in the tariff field and to turn its authority unrestrictedly over to a different branch of Government.

I hope we can defeat the second proposal, the one asking Congress to capitulate. I hope we can pass cotton legislation tomorrow, because it is devoted to a serious problem. I hope we can add to it an amendment which will give the same consideration to the timber people, to the poultry people, to the dairy people, to the producers of beef, to the producers of pork, and to the producers of lamb that we give to those who happen to be working with the fleecy substance known as cotton.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. I do commend the Senator from South Dakota for his very splendid presentation of this problem; for putting it in a perspective which avoids any parochial treatment of the problems of agriculture. The subject ought to be considered by category rather than by item. That is one of the pleas that our President is making currently in behalf of his trade expansion bill.

The Senator from South Dakota has been in Congress for many years. He has served with great distinction as a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and also as a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Perhaps he heard earlier this afternoon, during the debate of this subject, the suggestion that agriculture, insofar as the products of the Middle West are concerned—livestock, poultry, dairy, and timber, and so on—had better make a drive for a position similar to that now enjoyed by the cotton and related industries. In other words, it is suggested by some who have engaged in this discussion that the representatives of the States of the Middle West have been derelict and are guilty of laches, so to speak, for not having pursued this course of conduct earlier. We are accused of being Johnnies-come-lately, who are seeking to attach our amendment to a piece of legislation which has been designed and fashioned for another segment of agriculture.

I am wondering whether the Senator from South Dakota would subscribe to that, or whether he recalls the many things which have been done by the representatives of the Middle Western States in recent years to get relief from imports which have had as disastrous an impact as have cotton imports.

Mr. MUNDT. Indeed I have. I am glad the Senator has raised the subject. I do not want it to appear unchallenged in the RECORD that there has been a lack of diligence on the part of the producers of other products. Representatives of these producers have been coming to Washington time after time, and they have appeared before congressional committees time after time, and have presented testimony. They have presented testimony before the Commerce Committee from the standpoint of the timber industry, for example. They have appeared before the Tariff Commission time after time, seeking tariff relief, and they have made their appeals to the White House.

Somehow or other, that curious set of circumstances which has developed into a shower of all this largess upon the textile industry has never evolved for them.

I shall not make any allegations, but I have a hunch about it. It is a hunch which will gain some validity only after a rollcall vote is had in the Senate on this matter. If the hunch then develops into a showing that there have been those who have been induced—and I spell that word with an "i," not with an "s"—induced to go along with a program involving a complete capitulation of tariff controls by Congress, and if there are those who vote to subject themselves now to economic suicide, and act as they will act later, they will have sold out the interests of their people for the sorriest mess of pottage that has ever been put to mouth.

I hope that my hunch is not borne out. I hope for the sake of the country that my hunch is wrong. However, all of us and all those who read the RECORD will scan the rollcalls to see whether that Midwesterner's hunch was completely wrong and, if not, what degree of validity there was in it when the announcement was made here on the floor of the Senate in the middle of May.

I would urge my colleagues from the New England States and from the South, who are in trouble with cotton, to join us in supporting a policy and principle and program and ideal, good for all categories instead of confining themselves solely to a little piece of relief for a particular industry at a given time.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, might the Senator from South Dakota be suggesting, perhaps, that we rise above principle in this particular instance and grant relief to one industry and then, on the other hand, having cast our lot with a highly protectionist measure, which is much more protectionist than any McKinley protectionist measure could be—I say that because it involves

not only a high tariff, but a subsidy, an international cartel, and a quota system as well—we then consider a free trade proposal that might or might not be adopted? Would this approximate the thinking of the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. MUNDT. That might be one of the causes for my unhappy but, I hope, unfounded hunch. I hope subsequent rollcalls will prove that the hunch on the part of the Senator from South Dakota was wrong and that the suspicion of the Senator from Nebraska was unfounded. Of course only time can tell. History will record the verdict. Certainly it tends to emphasize both the Senator's suspicion and my hunch. I believe that we ought to consider these problems as a group, not piecemeal; that we ought to deal equitably with all those who will suffer from the same cause, and find a way to correct the situation which plagues all of them, and not simply try to correct that situation for the privileged few. I submit that if we go all out for a free-trade policy, this little anchor thrown out to windward on the part of those who propose to have this little consideration now for cotton and cotton textiles will find that they have sent a little boy to do the milking who could not quite get the job done. Ultimately they will suffer from the unhappy economic fate which confronts the rest of our raw producers, unless Congress insists now on the right to protect and safeguard them when they are really in serious trouble.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota further yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. I share the hope that any misgivings or any suspicion that might be entertained by anyone will not eventually materialize when, later this year, Congress will consider the basic tariff legislation. The Senator from Nebraska would be the last one who would wish to entertain any suspicion, doubt, or cynicism in this regard.

Earlier today, we heard many protestations from Senators on both sides of the aisle that it is not hostility to the desires and goals of the proponents of the pending amendment which prompts opposition to it, but rather it is a matter of timeliness. A time will come later, when the receptivity, the sympathy, and the compassion which have been expressed so plentifully here today can be proved. That time will come when we consider the proposal giving the President of the United States total and absolute power over tariff rates or concession on tariffs. It will then be necessary to decide whether that power should be circumscribed to a certain degree. One limitation seriously under consideration would affect the power of the President to deal with countries, or a combination of countries such as those which comprise the Common Market, which impose nontariff restrictions on farm products shipped from this country, virtually excluding the American farmer from those markets. In the judgment of the Senator from Nebraska, in such cases the President should have

severe limitations imposed upon his ability to reduce tariff rates on the manufactured products which the countries concerned seek to import into this country.

After all, we are not interested in making concessions to Europe, for example, on identical articles, because there is no percentage in lowering the tariff on beans or carrots or soybeans, and getting concessions on those same products. The point in making concessions is that we will make them on items which they have to sell to us, provided they will make concessions on things which we will want to sell them.

Tariffs are not the only means of keeping goods out of countries. There are many nontariff restrictions and limitations.

I share the hope of the Senator from South Dakota that there will not be those in Congress who will shut their eyes to the realities of life. I hope they will not support a request of unlimited power. The only proposal deserving support is one having careful safeguards to insure that the powers will be exercised without prejudice to American interests in the long run.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the Senator from Nebraska. I share that hope, not to the extent of having overconfidence, but in the realistic sense that this action will transpire as the Senator from Nebraska has urged.

In a sense, we suffer now, in connection with the proposed legislation, from the kind of centralization of too much power in the hands of too few persons involved in the suggested shift of the authority over tariff legislation from the people's representatives in Congress to the big politicians in the big offices at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue. By virtue of the arguments arrayed against our amendment. They say it has taken a long time to induce the White House to make this concession, to make this proposal. They say, "We have brought it down for cotton and textiles. Please, you people who represent timber, beef, sheep, poultry, and dairy products, don't bother us now. If you do that, the man who made the concession might be displeased; he might not go through with his negotiations. You might be putting a stop to the activation of the cotton program, which we have in good shape. The President might eliminate the consideration of cotton and the textile industries from the theories he has been expounding around the country about the advantages of broader trade. If you mess things up, it will be serious."

That indicates what might happen if we rely too long and too much on an individual or a single branch of the Government at the Executive end of the avenue. The people's voices will have been silenced. They can express themselves only through Congress. Out of the more than 2 million Federal employees at the other end of the avenue, remember that John Public can vote for only 2—the President and the Vice President. In Congress, he can act through 100 Senators. He votes for 437 Members of the House of Representatives. He has a chance to be heard.

He can talk with his Senators and Representatives. He can discuss the situation with them. All the ramifications of the problem are presented.

But that is impossible when the entire problem is placed in the hands of a great Federal apparatus which has only two persons whom the voter can reach at the ballot box in the polling place.

I think I sense the felling on the part of our southern friends about the consequences of transferring and delegating so much power to the President, as is requested in the proposed legislation which is now being considered by the Senate Finance Committee. We recall that one of them said, "I am not acting only for the cotton farmer; we have chicken farmers in my State." That is true. It is tough to go back to the people of an individual State and say, "I took care of the cotton farmer on the south side of the road, but I did not do anything for the chicken farmer on the north side of the road."

Another distinguished Senator said, "I have cowmen in my State. My State produces a large amount of cattle. It is kind of tough to be in the position of saying that I did what I could to protect the cotton man, but I could not do anything for the cowman." It is especially tough.

If by any chance we vote away forever our power at any time in the future, ever again to do anything for the chicken farmer or the cowman, because we have said we are bowing out, we are delegating to the White House our complete control over tariffs, the public should not blame us in Congress if things go wrong.

I submit there is no way we can escape that blame, because once we delegate authority to decide, we assume the responsibility for the decisions yet to be made, because we have conveyed away the right to make them.

We must be men of sturdier stuff than to go creeping back home, saying, "Don't blame me. All I did was to decapitate myself, to disfranchise myself, and delegate all the power to the other fellow. Blame the other fellow; he made all the mistakes." That cannot be done. Once we give up our power to represent the people, we have to be responsible for what is done by the other fellow who represents them in our place.

I express the hope that tomorrow it will be possible to work out some happy formula, so that we can legislate together on a matter of principle, policy, and philosophy, so that whatever we elect to do to be helpful to that little segment of our economy which seeks help and needs it—the cotton and the cotton textile industries—we will also do the same to be helpful to other segments of our economy in the agricultural area, which are suffering fully as much from identically the same cause and is in need of the same kind of remedy.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, in connection with the pending amendment, I wish to call attention to certain articles relating to the place of farmers of the United States in connection with the contemplated so-called Common Market. I ask unani-

mous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "Common Market and United States Agree on Farm Tariffs," by Felix Belair, Jr., published in the New York Times of January 16, 1962; an article entitled "Impact on United States Seen in Plan To Exclude Outside Goods" by J. H. Carmical, published in the same paper on February 4, 1962; a paragraph or two from the Wall Street Journal of April 17, 1962; and finally an article entitled "What It Means if We Join the Common Market," by John Freeman, published in News of the World, in London on May 6, 1962.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Jan. 16, 1962]

COMMON MARKET AND UNITED STATES AGREE
ON FARM TARIFFS

(By Felix Belair, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, January 15.—The European Economic Community has agreed to make tariff concessions on U.S. agricultural exports that last year had a value of from \$600 million to \$700 million, official sources said today.

U.S. negotiators considered as "unsatisfactory," however, proposed concessions on another group of more competitive farm commodities. These commodities had an export value of about \$400 million last year.

The United States rejected these concessions from the Economic Community, also known as the Common Market, with the understanding that they were subject to future negotiations.

An agreement, including the accepted concessions and reciprocal cuts on a wide range of manufactured products, is expected to be initiated in Brussels tomorrow. Meanwhile, the United States has served notice that in future negotiations it will insist on its "historic share" of the European market for farm exports.

COMMENT BY PRESIDENT

At his news conference today, President Kennedy guardedly expressed satisfaction with the arrangement. He said that the agreement was "on the whole satisfactory" and "is about the best that could be worked out."

The President cited two obstacles to any exchange of mutually satisfactory concessions on farm products between the United States and Western Europe. These were the rising productivity of European agriculture and the heavy balance of agricultural trade in favor of the United States.

Mr. Kennedy, in his first news conference of the year, observed that the United States in 1961 made commercial sales of farm products to Common Market countries valued at about \$1,100 million. Farm products purchased from such countries in the same period amounted to about \$200 million, he said.

From this he concluded, "It is very obvious that it is impossible for us to trade evenly with them on agriculture."

This concept was supported by major farm organizations in recent hearings on the Administration's new trade program before a Senate-House economic subcommittee. But the farm groups insisted that Western Europe grant agricultural concessions to the United States in return for U.S. concessions on manufactured and industrial products.

The President drew attention to the special problems involved in agricultural foreign trade and the 18 months devoted to negotiation of an agreement with the Common Market. He said these factors constituted a strong argument for his request for broader tariff-cutting authority than is provided by

the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act, which expires June 30.

The administration's new trade program has yet to be published in detail. It includes Presidential authority to negotiate tariff concessions up to 50 percent by whole categories of commodities, instead of item by item, as is done at present. It would also make it possible to end duties on a wide range of products in which the United States and Common Market countries account for 80 percent of world trade.

The President observed that Common Market countries had experienced an extraordinary economic growth. He said that his new program was intended to enable the United States to share in this growth through expanded trade opportunities and increasing employment at home.

The Common Market nations are West Germany, France, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands and Luxembourg.

The U.S. farm exports to the Common Market on which acceptable concessions have been offered include cotton, soybeans, tallow, hides and skins and most fruits and vegetables, official sources reported.

The products covered by proposed concessions that are regarded as "unsatisfactory" include wheat, feed grains, tobacco, rice, and livestock, including poultry.

Some private agricultural economists here believe that the concessions granted the United States had been largely limited to two categories. These are commodities in which this country dominates the world market and those which the Common Market countries have no plans for great expansion, these experts said.

They observed further that the products on which concessions had been "unsatisfactory" were those in which the United States had its major problem of surpluses.

Diplomatic sources suggested it would be a mistake to assume that more satisfactory concessions would not be forthcoming in future negotiations. They recalled that several Western Europe officials had stated publicly that U.S. farm exports should fare no worse after full realization of the Common Market's goal than before.

The President appeared confident at his news conference that the Members of Congress, when they examined all the facts, would support his new trade program.

"I believe that when the Members of the House and Senate have examined our proposal, examined its safeguards, examined what it can do for employment, I am hopeful—in fact I feel it very possible—that we can secure a majority," he said.

He termed the whole question of tariffs "a sophisticated matter, and it is difficult to explain quickly." But he said, "I think that when the educational job is done, I think the country will understand that it is in our best interest."

The President expressed his belief that the present food for peace program should be expanded. This program involves the "sale" of surplus commodities for foreign currencies without any financial return to this country.

In response to a question, the President also indicated that the domestic farm program contemplated legislative authority for rigid controls on production and marketing. The news conference, the 20th held by Mr. Kennedy, was his first since November 29. One that had been scheduled December 20 was canceled when the President's father, Joseph P. Kennedy, was stricken the day before in Palm Beach, Fla.

The news conference today was not televised as it occurred. It was recorded on both audio and video tape for later broadcast and televising.

The President, looking fit and still tan from his holiday stay in Florida, dealt with most questions briskly. He sprinkled his an-

swers with a wide variety of facts and statistics.

TALKS HELD IN BRUSSELS

BRUSSELS, Jan. 15.—United States and Common Market officials conferred at a technical level today. Both sides were hopeful that a final agreement on tariff reductions might be reached tomorrow.

Howard Petersen, President Kennedy's special adviser on trade, discussed tariff issues with Common Market experts. A negotiating session is scheduled for tomorrow with Jean Rey, of the Common Market commission.

A U.S. spokesman said: "We certainly hope they will be able to conclude an agreement tomorrow, but there will be nothing solid before that."

TRADE AID HAILS KENNEDY

SAN FRANCISCO, January 15.—Nelson A. Stitt, director of the United States-Japan Trade Council, said today that the chances were now "50-50" to get a liberalized foreign trade program through Congress this year. "Six months ago," he said, "we would have said there was no chance."

Mr. Stitt, at a news conference on a west coast visit, gave President Kennedy much of the credit for the asserted change.

"I think he has done a pretty good job at this," he said. "A lot of people see a link between our world position and trade. They are viewing trade as an essential element in our foreign policy."

[From the New York Times, Feb. 4, 1962]

IMPACT ON UNITED STATES SEEN IN PLAN TO
EXCLUDE OUTSIDE GOODS

(By J. H. Carmical)

The food-exporting nations are greatly concerned over the new agricultural policy recently adopted by the European Economic Community. And they should be, for a study of the plan shows that it envisions their exclusion from the world's largest single market.

Coming at a period when the United States, the biggest exporter of agricultural products, is in what has been described as "a crisis of abundance" in food supplies, the plan of the European trading bloc, usually referred to as the Common Market, threatens to result in a further curtailment of American agriculture.

This bold and imaginative plan, which was adopted only after the most deliberate considerations by the six member nations in the bloc, eventually may include all Western Europe into a single trading unit. Already most of the other countries in Western Europe, largely in self-defense, have signified an interest in becoming members.

TREMENDOUS POTENTIAL

Should the outsiders be admitted, the largest single trading bloc in history would result. Encompassing an estimated population of 250 million, its potential would be tremendous and its impact on world trade in food, raw materials and manufactured goods would be felt by every nation.

According to those who have closely watched the development of the Common Market, the adoption of the agricultural policy has removed the last major obstacle in the economic integration and possibly the political unification of the Western Continent.

The farm pact, considered the most significant development since the bloc was formed 4 years ago, has the specific objective of making member countries collectively self-sufficient in food production.

The expansion of farm production, which will involve new tractors and other farming equipment, would be a major spur to the industrial development of these six countries—Western Germany, France, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxembourg.

The new farm policy necessarily will mean a great shift in the world trade routes and it looks as if the United States ultimately will lose a large part of its biggest export cash market for farm products. This will be a serious blow because of the present heavy excess production of these items and the huge surpluses already built up.

In an effort to alleviate the burdensome surpluses, of which storage costs alone amount to nearly \$1 billion a year, the Kennedy administration is advocating an entirely new farm program that includes a drastic restriction of production over a long period as well as the gradual disposal of a portion of the inventories, mostly held by the U.S. Government.

To what extent the new Common Market policy on agriculture influenced the President's message to Congress last week is not known, but the prospect of losing a part of the European market must have contributed to some extent at least to the proposals to drastically limit farming operations here.

The essentials of the Common Market agreement are these:

The gradual elimination of all tariffs against each other over the next 7½ years, starting from July 1.

The establishment of identical price supports in each member country.

The imposition of tariffs on farm products imported from outside sources at rates equal to the difference between the world price and the Common Market support price.

PRICE SETUP UNKNOWN

The question that remains unresolved is at what level the new Common Market prices for agricultural products are to be set. It has been tentatively agreed, however, that eventually they would be established somewhere between the present French and German levels.

Western Germany has higher price supports than the other members. The support price on wheat, for instance, is \$3 a bushel, against \$2.20 in France. This would indicate that the price support on wheat would be about \$2.60 a bushel should the tentative agreement be carried out. Price supports on other major crops probably would be on the same relative basis.

Support prices at such levels would stimulate agricultural operations in most sections of the Common Market. Since it would apply for a long period, it would enable the farmers to mechanize with the most modern tools, and this should result in an increase in the yield an acre.

Farming would become more efficient and the farmers using outdated methods would be "frozen out" in somewhat the same way they have been here in the last 15 years. Many had to leave the farms in this period because of the technological revolution in farming.

RISE IN EFFICIENCY

This would result in a more efficient European agriculture and would make available to industry there those persons who have been pushed off the farms. Substitution of tractors for animal power, which is still largely used on many European farms, would release grain for the production of meat and other foods for human consumption.

Generally, what is envisaged by the Common Market countries in agriculture is not unlike what has taken place in the United States in the last 10 years. During that period, farming in this country has gone through a technological revolution and has been almost completely mechanized.

Through the development of higher yielding seed, the use of more fertilizer and the adoption of better cultivating methods, including the use of chemicals to kill weeds and grass, the yields to an acre here have risen sharply.

Better methods of feeding livestock, including the use of antibiotics, also have resulted in a greater utilization of the larger amount of grain produced on an acre. Now it takes only about one-half as much grain to produce a pound of meat as it did 10 or 15 years ago.

SELF-SUFFICIENCY GOAL

There is not much doubt that the Common Market countries, by following reasonably closely the methods used here, soon can become self-sufficient in food production. In fact, within a few years, it is quite likely that Europe may become an exporter of food rather than an importer.

The present support prices, which are high enough to encourage production in most countries, will be continued at least until next year's harvest. Although some may be adjusted downward a bit in certain areas, the knowledge that support prices will be continued and that a market will be guaranteed for products raised will stimulate activity even before the plan is put into effect.

Under the plan, an agricultural fund is to be created that would be used to aid farmers unable to finance needed equipment, to bolster markets if they should drop below the support level and to subsidize the exports of any agricultural product that develops an excessive supply.

The money for this common fund would be raised through the variable import levies on farm products from outside the Common Market. These imports now amount to some \$3½ billion a year, of which West Germany receives roughly \$1½ billion.

World prices for agricultural products now are generally below the lowest support prices of any in the Common Market countries so, at the start, the fund may grow rapidly. As the bloc approaches self-sufficiency, the accumulations will drop, but at that time its needs will not be so great.

By agreeing to the agricultural policy, the Common Market countries are described as having passed the point of no return on their road to unity. This was the last occasion when the development of the project could be stopped by the vote of a single member country. Unless all members agree to stop it, which seems most unlikely, the terms of the Treaty of Rome, which was signed by the six members in 1957, provide that it continue in effect until the economic unification of the six nations is complete.

Now that the Common Market is more or less permanently established, the question naturally arises as to how many more of the European nations may join in the near future. Britain has made a bid to join, and Denmark and Norway are expected to seek membership. At first, some of the other nations may just seek associate memberships.

Regardless of how many, if any, of the other nations in Europe obtain membership, the Common Market is bound to bring about a sharp decline in imports of farm products to the six member countries. Because of the variable tariff duties, the United States would be able to sell those countries only those items they could not produce. This would be only cotton.

In 1960, the United States sold farm products amounting to \$1,100 million to the Common Market countries, or nearly one-fourth of the total agricultural exports of \$4,824,187,000. A large portion of these exports was part of foreign-aid programs and payments were not received in dollars for nearly \$1,500 million of them. Deducting these foreign shipments, the Common Market accounted for about one-third of this country's agricultural exports in dollars actually received.

U.S. exports of farm products to all of Europe in 1960 amounted to some \$2 billion, all of which was paid for in dollars. If Britain and other European countries should become members of the Common Market, much of these exports would be in jeopardy.

Cotton and soybeans appear to be the only two major farm products grown here that would be permitted free importation into Common Market under the present plan. Since soybeans could be produced in the area, it probably would be only a short time before one of the countries in the group would decide to grow them, and an import levy by all then would follow.

Eventually grain exports from the United States to the Common Market would virtually cease. In 1960, feed-grain exports to these countries amounted to 181 million bushels, or 41 percent of the total of 439 million bushels exported.

Although this country's sales of food products to the Common Market may drop to a very low level, prospects are that there may be some increase in sales of cotton. With the standard of living expected to increase further, the use of cotton by the bloc should rise and this may partly offset the decline in shipments of food items from this country.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 17, 1962]

EUROPEAN BARRIERS

European barriers to U.S. grain and poultry exports worry Federal farm men.

As a result of expected restrictions by the six-nation Common Market, U.S. officials now figure wheat sales to the bloc could fall by 1965 to around \$35 million from \$120 million now. Poultry shipments might fall far below the current \$36 million pace. Feed grain exports, running around \$200 million now, would be least affected; land-short Europeans are reluctant to divert acreage to these crops.

Under pressure from European farmers, Common Market officials have agreed to set price supports within the six-nation community high enough to encourage internal production of wheat, feed grains, and poultry; by 1970, the six plan to adopt a new support schedule. Farmers will be insulated from U.S. competition by a variable import fee equal to the difference between internal price supports and lower U.S. export prices.

U.S. officials count heavily on congressional passage of the President's freer trade bill for bargaining power to use against European restrictions.

[From News of the World, London, May 6, 1962]

WHAT IT MEANS IF WE JOIN THE COMMON MARKET

(By John Freeman)

"What exactly is this Common Market," asked my friend in the park, "and what does it matter to me if Britain joins it?" A difficult question, but I had to go at it.

It's a group of six nations: France, Belgium, Holland, Luxembourg, West Germany, and Italy. They're sometimes called the European Economic Community and they have signed the Treaty of Rome, which pledges them to follow a common economic policy.

Between now and 1970 they are abolishing all tariffs between one another and all limitations on the free movement of companies or workers inside the market. What's more, they've set up a Council of Ministers and a small-scale international civil service to draw up the rules and see that they are obeyed.

YOUR JOB

If Britain goes in, our industries and agriculture will have to compete with the other members without any protection. Some will do well out of that, some badly.

Who would be the unlucky ones?

If I worked in motor cars or shipbuilding or market gardening or chemicals or paper and printing, I should be a bit anxious about my job.

And if I lived in Scotland or Northern Ireland I'd worry because unemployment is

already too high there, and the Government would no longer have the power to direct new industries into hard-hit areas.

But if I worked in coal, steel, heavy vehicles, textiles, or manufactured clothing, I'd be pleased.

What would happen to wages?

They would tend to even out over the whole market. But this would not necessarily harm British workers. Wages and production have recently been rising much faster inside the market than in Britain.

Still, a large area of unemployment like southern Italy must tend to undercut wages in the high employment areas because its people can go and seek work anywhere in the Community—including Britain—if we join.

Incidentally, there's to be equal pay for women throughout the Market by the end of 1964. This will cost industry a packet, but the burden will be roughly equal for all the countries except France. She'll get off lighter because her existing difference between men's and women's rates is small.

Would membership of the Market mean lower social service benefits in Britain?

Not directly. Some social benefits—e.g. family allowances—are higher in the Community than in Britain. But the state pays a smaller percentage of the cost and the worker and employer pay more.

Since one of the purposes of the Community is to "harmonize" tax policies, the British system would gradually change to the continental pattern. That would be fine when times are good. But in a slump the worker gets more protection from the British system.

PRICES UP

Are our farmers in some special danger?

The fruit and vegetable growers are—and perhaps the sugarbeet and dairy farmers. But most farmers would do about as well as they do now. The rest of us might suffer a bit—especially the poorer people.

The present system of subsidies would come to an end and the public would pay higher prices for food. Perhaps about 10 percent more in the end. To balance that, taxes might be slightly lower.

Should we have to go over to decimals and meters and driving on the right?

Not necessarily, but it might be a good idea.

Would British membership mean the end of the Commonwealth?

No. But it would mean the end of preferential trading inside the Commonwealth. There is a high tariff between the Market and the world outside.

This makes it very difficult for the Commonwealth countries to sell the food and raw materials to the Market countries.

That's why Canada, Australia, and New Zealand, who traditionally sell us their farm produce, are so set against our going in.

Would our Government be free to do whatever it thought necessary for the good of Britain?

The rules of the Market are being added to all the time. But at present, member governments are quite free except in their economic policy. There they have made binding pledges.

One reason, for instance, why many Labour politicians are against the Market is that Britain would probably be barred from some of the policies in Labour's election program.

Of course there are people in the Market who want it to become a complete federation, with the members giving up all their sovereignty. But there's no majority for that now, and maybe there never will be. Don't forget that Britain would have an equal vote with France, West Germany, and Italy.

What is the real argument for going in?

It turns on the answer to a simple question. The Common Market is already a very powerful and rapidly growing trade group

which has outstripped Britain in recent years: Are we likely to do better outside in direct competition, or inside sharing the benefits and putting up with the disadvantages?

And what's the answer?

That's for you to decide. I'll make just two comments: First, we shouldn't be in too much of a hurry.

Whatever the final decision, I don't want Britain committed to permanent membership till I'm sure there are stable democratic governments in both Germany and France.

Second, this is one of the gravest decisions Britain has ever faced. We, the people, should make it, and tell our Government what we want.

So far, the Government has treated us like children, not giving us the facts we need to make up our minds. I call on them now to tear down their curtain of secrecy and trust the British people to make a sensible decision.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. All the articles deal with the problem of the farmer in case of adherence by Great Britain to the Common Market, and in the case of any trade agreements that might be entered into by the United States. The gist of the articles is that very grave questions would be raised for farm produce of the United States. The possibility is suggested that the only export market which would remain for us in the dollar market of Western Europe would be the market for cotton, and possibly soybeans, for a limited period of time. But the dollar market which was worth well over \$1 billion to the American farmer last year may be seriously impaired unless adequate protective provisions are placed in the agreement. One of those protections is sought by the amendment which is being proposed by my distinguished colleague [Mr. MUNDT] in behalf of himself, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], myself, and other Senators.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I am concerned about several aspects of the bill. One of them is why the bill has not been considered by the Committee on Finance, which is now considering the proposed Trade Expansion Act of 1962.

It seems to me that a bill designed to guide our policy regarding foreign trade certainly should be considered by the Senate Finance Committee, and I cannot understand why no effort has been made to have it considered by that committee.

In the debate in the House on this particular measure, no responsive answer was given to a query as to why the bill was not considered, along with the proposed Trade Expansion Act of 1962, in the House Ways and Means Committee.

I also wish to ask whether there is any intention on the part of the proponents of this bill that it be inconsistent with the Trade Agreements Act now on the statute books or with the proposed Trade Expansion Act of 1962. Possibly the distinguished Senator from Maine may be able to enlighten me in regard to this matter. Is there any intention, which does not now meet the eye, to have this bill be inconsistent with those measures?

Mr. MUSKIE. I can only state that the proposed Trade Expansion Act of 1962, as well as the current trade policy,

as written in the legislation now on the statute books, recognizes the need for adjustment provisions. After all, trade always involves adjustments. Sometimes the adjustments come in private sectors; sometimes they come as a result of governmental policy.

The textile agreements involved in the pending bill were negotiated under present law; and present law provides for this method of adjustment in connection with agricultural products or manufactured products thereof, and that relief is available both to the textile industry and—as has been agreed by all Senators who have spoken this afternoon on the subject—to the very ones for whom the present amendment would provide relief. So such relief is available under existing law. Whether it would be provided by the Trade Expansion Act of 1962—I now refer to the Senator's second question—is, in my opinion, a matter of interpretation. A little later, I shall address myself to that subject.

I believe that relief of this kind should be available to all industries which meet similar criteria in regard to injury or risk of injury.

In connection with the proposed Trade Expansion Act of 1962, I think there is some question, whether relief of this kind would be available to other industries if that measure were passed. However, I do not think the Trade Expansion Act would repeal section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956, under which this relief is available.

So my present guess is that, regardless of the action taken on the proposed Trade Expansion Act of 1962, this relief will continue to be available in the area of agricultural commodities.

Mr. MILLER. I understand, Mr. President, that the proposed Trade Expansion Act of 1962 would not repeal section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956, which the pending bill seeks to amend.

The Senator from Maine is also familiar with the fact that some think section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 should be completely eliminated; they think it is unnecessary, that it is surplusage; and they believe that all these provisions should be dovetailed and combined in a new trade act or should be included in the proposed Trade Expansion Act of 1962.

Frankly, I do not know exactly what should be done; I do not know whether section 204 should be repealed or should not be repealed. My point is that if it remains on the statute books, I find it inconceivable that the proponents of this bill would expect it to be inconsistent with the Trade Agreements Act—under which this multilateral agreement has recently been negotiated—and also would expect it to be inconsistent with the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, when and if that measure is passed by the Congress. So I should like to have that assurance.

Mr. MUSKIE. I reply to the distinguished Senator by saying that our trade policy is composed of all legislation on the subject now on the statute books; and our present trade policy includes both the Reciprocal Trade Agreements

Act and the legislation in that field outside that act—such as section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956.

If the Senator from Iowa is asking me whether the text of this measure is consistent with the text of the present trade policy, the answer is that, of course, it is, because it has been negotiated under the present law. Furthermore, if, following enactment of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, this measure is still on the statute books, then obviously the two will be consistent, and this measure will be a part of the whole.

All legislation involves adjustment. The Tariff Act was one of the first pieces of legislation enacted by the first Congress of the United States, and tariff legislation has been on the statute books from the time of the very beginning of our Government. We are not likely to have free trade in the near future; but our objective is to have trade expansion without having free trade, and I believe that is what we are talking about now. Side by side with our debate on trade expansion, we are concerned with trade-adjustment problems which concern various industries throughout the country; and I believe this measure is consistent with trade expansion and with providing relief of this kind to industries, adversely affected by imports, which can meet whatever criteria regarding injury the Congress deems realistic.

Mr. MILLER. I should like to ask another question: Beginning with line 9 of the bill, it is proposed to authorize the President, in order to carry out such multilateral agreements—and there could be many different ones; but, for all practical purposes, we are talking about the 1-year agreement and the 5-year agreement in regard to textiles—to issue regulations governing the entry or the withdrawal from warehouse of products coming from countries not parties to the agreements.

I am concerned in regard to whether those regulations might be inconsistent with the Trade Agreements Act or with other trade agreements acts or with the Trade Expansion Act of 1962; and I shall appreciate it very much if I may have a commitment on that point, because if I cannot get it, it is my thought that I may offer an amendment to make that point very clear. I think it might be healthy to do so in any event, because there will be some who will be concerned in regard to whether, since we are dealing with section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956, somehow or other we are slipping in something which may defeat the purposes of the Trade Agreements Acts and also the purposes of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962.

Mr. MUSKIE. I am sure I cannot make a commitment in behalf of the sponsors of the bill; but I may be able to suggest at least an explanation of the nature of the regulations intended to be issued pursuant to the provisions the Senator has mentioned.

I refer the Senator to page 2 of the Senate committee report, on which appears a copy of a letter from Edward Gudeman, Under Secretary of Commerce, to the Vice President. About 10

lines from the bottom of the page appears this sentence:

Since countries accounting for 90 percent of the free world trade in cotton textiles are participants, the same authority which the President has already been delegated by section 204 should clearly be extended to nonparticipants to prevent the minority of countries which choose to stay out of the arrangements from thereby gaining an advantage over the countries which participate in them.

It is my understanding that the regulation to which the bill refers are regulations which would apply to nonparticipants in the textile agreements the same kind of restrictions which participants in such textile agreements have voluntarily accepted. That is my understanding.

If the Senator has a further question, I shall be glad to refer it, as the RECORD will refer it, to those in charge of the bill.

Mr. MILLER. I appreciate the attempt of the Senator from Maine to answer the question. I realize he had no notice that I was about to propound this question. I think it might be well, for the RECORD, to submit an amendment, have it read and printed, and have it appear in the RECORD, because I would like to have that assurance when the bill is reached tomorrow.

Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment, and ask that it be read and printed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Amend H.R. 10788 by striking the period (.) and quotation marks in line twelve and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"Provided, That such regulations shall be consistent with all other Trade Agreements acts and all agreements negotiated thereunder and shall conform to all procedures set forth in said acts."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I have one final concern about this bill. On line 7 we find the phrase "a significant part of world trade." I must confess that I do not know what "a significant part of world trade" means for the purpose of the bill, except that, insofar as some of the debates on the House side are concerned, it apparently means a significant impact on the national interest of the United States.

I do not know how many of us know exactly what that means. For the purposes of this legislation, it is not going to mean what Congress says it means. It is going to mean what the President of the United States determines in his own mind to be a significant part of world trade. It may be 90 percent for the purposes of the textile industry, but, under this bill, it could be 2 percent. I do not know, because the bill goes to many other products than textiles.

I suggest to my colleagues that it might be well to spell out a little more specifically what is meant by "a significant part," so Congress will be the agency to determine what it is, rather than have the executive branch of the Government make that determination.

It is dangerous to allow this authority to go too far. I recognize the desirability of giving the executive branch of the Government considerable leeway in negotiating agreements. When there are multilateral agreements, such as that which has been negotiated with respect to textiles, probably it is well for the executive branch of the Government to have considerable authority. What I object to is that today we may have an administration which will place one meaning on "significant part of world trade," and tomorrow we may have another administration, which will have its own interpretation of it. The only way it can be made clear is for the Congress itself to spell out what it means.

If the proponents of the bill would spell it out and say 90 percent, or 80 percent, or 50 percent, it seems to me we would have a more definite basis on which to legislate in such an important part of our foreign policy.

I yield the floor.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLER. I am glad to yield.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Maine has the floor.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I am happy to yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. I assume the Senator has not yielded the floor.

Mr. MUSKIE. That is correct.

Mr. HRUSKA. The Senator from Nebraska is a little mystified. A basic part of section 204 gives the President absolute power to make agreements with reference to agricultural products of all kinds. Now the Senator from Iowa wants to take a somewhat technical action, it seems to me, by defining what a part of section 204, which we are asked to enact without amendment, signifies. Apparently the Senator is talking about lack of definition of one word. Is there any doubt that whatever the President says is significant will be significant. Under the provisions of the bill, if it is to be amended as the Senator requests, whatever the President says is not significant will not be considered significant. Is that not about the size of it?

Mr. MILLER. The Senator from Nebraska knows exactly what I am getting at. He and I are very much in harmony on this point. What we object to is the grant of unlimited authority to the executive branch of the Government to make the determination as to what is "a significant part" under section 204. As the Senator has pointed out, the President has unlimited authority. Now it is proposed to add to his unlimited authority the authority to determine what is "a significant part."

I was not present at the time section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 was passed, but from what I have read about it, and particularly what I have read in the debates in the House in this session of Congress, it would not take much to persuade me that section 204 ought to be repealed and that we ought to dovetail one piece of legislation, such as the Trade Agreements Act, or the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 all the powers which the President has. But I do not think

it is going to help matters to take the unlimited power that now exists in section 204 and add to that power the unlimited power to determine what "a significant part of world trade" is. I think it is high time to start restoring to Congress some of the power it should have.

Mr. HRUSKA. Power feeds on power. Section 204 grants the President unlimited power to make agreements. He comes back and says, "Give me more power, because that section does not give me any power to deal with nonagreement countries. Give me more power." Congress apparently is about to grant it to him.

I have no doubt that soon thereafter he will come back to Congress and say, "You have given me power, without limitation or restriction. But I want more power, because I cannot use this power unless you give me more power."

I agree with the Senator from Iowa that perhaps there should be a repeal of section 204, in keeping with other tariff legislation.

Mr. MILLER. In response to the Senator from Nebraska, let me say that while I could readily be persuaded to repeal section 204, with the understanding that all the powers and duties with respect to the Trade Agreement Act be dovetailed with the existing Trade Agreements Acts or with the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, I am content to confine my action on this particular bill in that respect by making it clear that nothing in this bill shall be inconsistent with any of those acts.

I fear that some interpretation may be attached to the bill which will be inconsistent with those acts. If the inconsistency were pointed out, it could be said, "This is a separate act of Congress, and even though it be inconsistent with the other acts it is on the statute books; so it must have been the intention of Congress that it be done this way."

If we adopted a clarifying amendment along the line of the one read it would remove any doubts. Then when the President or the administration acted under the existing Trade Agreements Act, or when the President acted under the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, when and if it is passed, there would not be any danger of inconsistency between this measure and those acts.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, on the point which has been raised by the Senator from Iowa I point out that the language of section 204 reads in part:

The President may, whenever he determines such action appropriate, negotiate with representatives of foreign governments in an effort to obtain agreements limiting the export from such countries and the importation into the United States of any agricultural commodity or product manufactured therefrom or textiles or textile products.

There is no limitation upon the President with respect to the percentage of total world trade which must be involved in any such negotiation. The President could conduct such negotiation with countries which are involved in respect to only 10 percent, let alone a significant

percentage, of world trade. Really, the word "significant," as found in the pending bill, would be more restrictive upon the President's power than section 204 as it now reads. I offer this as an observation for the RECORD.

Mr. President, I have a few brief remarks to make in the context of the debate on the pending bill.

First, let me say to the sponsors of the amendment that it is not possible for the Senate to give to the beef producers, the pork producers, the lamb producers, the poultry producers, or the dairy producers the kind of relief which the bill would give to the textile industry. We cannot negotiate, on the Senate floor, agreements with the countries which are involved. Indeed, we cannot give even any assurance on the Senate floor that the countries involved would undertake to negotiate such agreements with the United States.

It is not possible for us, however eloquent we may be, and however justified the plea by the sponsors of the amendment may be—will it though we may—to give them the kind of relief which the bill would give to the textile industry. That is not within our power.

It is possible for the Senate to veto relief for the textile industry. That would be the effect of the pending amendment. The Senate could veto relief to the textile industry, but it does not have the power to grant similar relief to the other industries which have been mentioned.

I have said in the course of the debate that, in my judgment, industries in like circumstances which can meet similar criteria of injury ought to be given similar relief. As a Senator from the State of Maine, where cotton textiles represent an important segment of the economy, understandably I am gratified that we should have the benefit of these textile agreements.

In my judgment, this multilateral arrangement, which is without precedent, between the United States and 18 other nations covering 90 percent of the free world trade in cotton textiles, represents a sensible trade adjustment in a commodity in respect to which production in low-wage, highly industrialized areas threatens to disrupt the world market.

Moreover, not only is it a sensible trade adjustment with respect to textiles but also, if approved by the Senate, it would be a desirable precedent—I submit this for consideration of the sponsors of the amendment—for similar action in respect to the industries faced with similar conditions. The sponsors of the amendment are doing themselves and the people they represent a disservice by making it difficult and perhaps impossible for the Senate to establish a precedent.

I am happy to support the pending bill because I think it is essential to the reinforcement and strengthening of such agreements. Unless the President has authority to deal with countries not complying with such voluntary trade agreements, the value of such agreements will be lost.

It has been made clear on the floor this afternoon that a number of other

commodities, not limited to agricultural commodities, are involved in the same kind of trade problem which has confronted the cotton textile industry.

In New England, in my own State, for example, the shoe industry is plagued by a rapid increase in imports from low-wage countries.

I quote from a release which was issued by Mr. Maxwell Field, executive vice president of the New England Shoe and Leather Association, which highlights the scope of the problem:

Shoe Imports rose 471 percent from 1955 to 1961—

Let me emphasize this—in 6 years shoe imports into this country rose 471 percent—

Import volume was 37.8 million pairs in 1961, equal to 6.1 percent of domestic output.

Despite this tremendous increase from 1955 to 1961, in the first quarter of 1962, this year, leather type shoe imports increased 84 percent over the same quarter of 1961.

This is the kind of problem which faces another industry in New England and in my own State, so I am not unaware of the nature of the problem which confronts the sponsors of the amendment. I urge that we allow the textile agreements to become established as a desirable precedent for similar situations facing similar industries.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the release by Mr. Field may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHOE INDUSTRY SERIOUSLY CONCERNED BY INCREASING IMPORTS

"The shoe manufacturing industry has gone on record as recognizing the need for a national program of full employment and trade expansion but, at the same time, it has expressed serious concern as to its ability to survive as a healthy industry in the face of increasing shoe imports." Maxwell Field, executive vice president of the New England Shoe and Leather Association, explained the industry's concern with sharply higher import shoe volume in meetings conducted by the association this week for its Massachusetts members.

"The shoe industry in New England," Mr. Field pointed out, "employs over 80,000 workers in 380 plants, and when employees in allied and shoe supply industries are included, total employment equals 125,000. The shoe industry is the second largest manufacturing employer in Massachusetts, with 39,000 workers and an additional 17,800 employees in the leather and allied industries."

"Shoes are the No. 1 manufacturing industries in both Maine and New Hampshire. In Maine, employment totals 21,100 shoe workers plus 3,100 in allied firms. New Hampshire employed 17,900 shoe workers plus 2,800 employees in supply industries. All employment figures are for the year 1961."

"New England produces one-third of all the shoes manufactured in the United States. In 1961, this totaled 200 million pairs valued at \$778 millions. Massachusetts is the leading shoe producing State in the Nation—Maine is fifth and New Hampshire is sixth in size."

Mr. Field also pointed out that "the shoe industry is sponsoring three key amendments to H.R. 9900, President Kennedy's Trade Ex-

pansion Act of 1962, which must be incorporated in the measure to safeguard the local shoe manufacturing industry, and its suppliers, which face increasingly severe competition from foreign shoe imports."

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 9900

The three major amendments, among other, follow:

1. An amendment to section 201(a) authority for all trade agreements, which would give the President the power to "order other additional import restrictions."

This amendment merely insures that the President will continue to have the power, which he now has under existing law, to protect American industry by restricting the amount of imports.

2. An escape clause amendment, restoring the escape clause provisions of the present law, provides for relief for an industry injured seriously by foreign competition.

3. The proposed peril point amendment to the bill would merely insure substantial continuance of existing law on this subject.

SHOE IMPORTS INCREASING AT ALARMING RATE

Shoe imports rose 471 percent from 1955 to 1961. Import volume was 37.8 million pairs in 1961, equal to 6.1 percent of domestic output.

Leather type shoe imports increased 84 percent in first quarter of 1962 over 1961—or twice our estimated rate of increase. Such volume of imports—now equal to over 8 percent of U.S. production—under existing duties, substantiates fears of shoe manufacturers for survival.

Mr. Field concluded that "shoe imports, principally from low-wage countries such as Japan and Italy, have already reached serious proportions and represent a major threat to local shoe manufacturers and in the future endangers job security of many workers in these plants.

"If imports of leather footwear continue to increase in such substantial amounts at current tariff rates, then these figures can expand by 50 to 100 percent under H.R. 9900, with its reduced tariff authorization. This rapid increase represents simply a case of lower priced labor in foreign countries competing against higher priced labor in America.

"The necessity for the shoe industry's proposed amendments to H.R. 9900 are, therefore, self-evident."

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUSKIE. I am happy to yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. The Senator from Maine has indicated that the proposed amendment to the bill, the so-called Mundt amendment, is predicated upon the President entering into multilateral agreements with respect to products other than cotton or cotton textiles.

The Senator raises the question as to what would happen if the President were unable to negotiate such multilateral agreements with respect to the other products. In that event, would the whole bill, including cotton textiles and the cotton industry, be stymied? Would it be held in abeyance?

That is a possibility. I can visualize a situation in which the President might not be able to negotiate a multilateral agreement with reference to timber and timber products, or dairy products, or any of the other categories.

Does the Senator from Maine think such a situation could be met by a modification of the amendment, to provide for a good-faith effort on the part of the President to enter into such multilateral agreements, and that, if he is

unable to do so, he could then impose similar limitations on imports in a particular category, notwithstanding the fact that a multilateral agreement was not entered into?

Mr. MUSKIE. The Senator's suggestion would improve the amendment. In further answer to the Senator, 18 other countries were involved in the negotiations. It is not a simple matter to persuade 18 countries, with their different problems and political situations, to reach agreement on a subject as delicate as the one we are considering. The present agreement has been in force for 1 year. A permanent agreement which has been negotiated will go into effect next fall. To undertake to negotiate a similar agreement for the industries covered by the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] would be time-consuming. I assume it would be at least as time-consuming as were the textile negotiations. Those negotiations were in process for 2 or 3 years. To hold up the textile agreements over such a period of time would in effect destroy them. I doubt very much that the other 18 countries involved would consent to stand by and allow us to hold their signed check for that period of time, with power in us to cash it only if our own interests justified our doing so.

Mr. HRUSKA. Does not the Senator believe that the 18 nations which entered into the multilateral agreement on cotton would not also be farseeing, wise, and prudent enough to realize that if they loosed their textile exports into this country, they would meet with a stonewall of absolute protectionism? They know that. That is one of the main incentives to induce such countries to enter into multilateral agreements. If they are improvident, they will defeat their own ends and will come out with less than they now have.

Mr. MUSKIE. Does the Senator suggest that those countries might consider themselves improvident if they did not insist that the United States meet a commitment which the United States had already made in order to get the agreement of those countries? What we are considering has been negotiated.

Mr. HRUSKA. No; it has not.

Mr. MUSKIE. They have agreed. The conflicting pressures which influence all the negotiating countries have been compromised in the agreement. Now it is proposed to inject another factor. We would say, "In addition to the other conditions which we asked you to meet, we want you to wait until we try to negotiate similar agreements for livestock, beef, poultry, timber, and dairy products." Would the other 18 countries take kindly to that kind of condition?

Mr. HRUSKA. I respectfully suggest that all the contingencies have not been met. The countries to which we refer have been provident enough to say, "We will not give final approval to the long-range agreement unless you first take care of the nonagreement countries." That is the purpose of the proposed act before us now. They say, "We will not enter into this arrangement unless the

nonagreeing countries are taken care of."

Mr. MUSKIE. That was a part of the original agreement.

Mr. HRUSKA. It is not a part of the original agreement, as I understand. The Senator may be correct. I am sure he has been following the subject longer than I have.

But another point stands in the way. We are told, "If the petition handed to the Tariff Commission by the Secretary of Agriculture at the President's request, asking for an equalization fee of 8½ cents per pound on either cotton or textiles, is granted, there will be no agreement on our part to the multilateral agreement that was negotiated in Geneva, Switzerland." So certain conditions have been imposed upon us. That is the reason for the present debate. The bill under consideration today in the Senate is one of the conditions insisted upon before the long-range 5-year agreement is consummated in final form.

What is wrong with a shrewd Yankee trader saying, "That is fine. We will go along with you. But there are certain things that we want before we go forward with this agreement." I do not see anything wrong with that approach.

Mr. MUSKIE. We would then probably be dealing with an entirely different set of countries.

Mr. HRUSKA. Very well.

Mr. MUSKIE. We would then be required to ask the 18 countries to stand by. In effect we would say, "Hold your cards. We will take 2 or 3 years to deal with the other countries on the subject of livestock before we proceed further. We will deal with other countries on the subject of poultry."

There may be some overlap. Some of the same countries may be involved in the consideration of other products. However, we would ask the representatives of those 18 countries to cool their heels for the 2 or 3 years that might be required to make a good-faith effort, if the Mundt amendment, which would satisfy the poultry and meat producers, were agreed to.

If the Senate should adopt the Mundt amendment, I see no reason why we should not add to the bill the shoe and leather industry. The Senator was occupied in conversation when I previously stated the figures. From 1955 to 1961 shoe imports increased by 471 percent. The shoe industry is the largest employer in my State. As an employer, it is larger than the textile industry. It is larger than the pulp and paper industry. As an employer, in my State, the pulp and paper industry is an immense industry, as the Senator, as a liberal trade proponent, may know.

If the Senator from Nebraska can cover the interests of his constituents in the bill, why should I not add the shoe and leather industry? Why should not Senators in whose States the electronics industry is suffering similar problems add amendments to cover that industry? Why do we not make the pending bill the new trade bill? Why do we not forget about the President's trade expansion bill and the opportunity that it provides for us to write an overall trade policy for the

country, make the pending bill the new trade bill and include every import-affected industry in the bill?

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUSKIE. I am happy to yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. I would be happy to have those considerations brought before the Senate. But I point out to the Senator that if section 204 should be expanded to include other commodities, the proposal would be referred to the Senate Committee on Finance. I assure the Senator from Maine that if it should be referred to that committee, it would never again see the light of day. In my judgment members of that committee would not consent to give the President of the United States absolute life and death authority over all commodities, without any restriction whatsoever. I do not believe they will do so later this year.

The Senator suggested that I was distracted in conversation when he recited figures concerning the shoe industry. I heard the statistics. They do not surprise me. In our State there was a healthy watch industry. For years, through the Tariff Commission and through the President, we tried to obtain some relief from foreign imports. We found none. I still remember the black Thursday when the president of that company called the office of the Senator from Nebraska and said, "I am sorry to tell you that all your efforts have been in vain. We are closing our factory in Lincoln, Nebr., and will cease making any more Elgin watches. We are scrapping the machinery and are selling the real estate."

So the comments of the Senator from Maine about the dire straits of the shoe industry can be compared to similar problems which we have had in Nebraska. No longer is there a watch industry in our State. I am aware of these problems; but we cannot brood this relief beyond agricultural products because section 204 deals only with agriculture.

Mr. MUSKIE. What is agriculture? Section 204 deals with agricultural products and manufactured products thereof. The shoes I have on my feet came from the back of some animal, the very livestock that produces the beef which the Senator's amendment would protect. Under the argument of the Senator from Nebraska, which would limit amendments to agricultural products, what would prevent me from moving to include the shoe industry? I would not include it on my own motion because I think there is another road which I can travel. I believe there is another road that the Senator from Nebraska can travel in order to obtain relief and write into the fundamental trade policy of this country the necessary protection.

We are dealing with an industry which, like others, needs protection. The textile industry, by reason of circumstances which may have been fortuitous, but for which the textile industry and its spokesmen were responsible, has been fighting this problem. When I was elected Governor in 1954 I was in the midst of the fight. It had been in progress for several years before. It has been continuing since that time. By the effort, sweat,

and the circumstances of those affected, which appealed apparently to those with authority to help, they have made their case. It is before us, with only one final step to be taken to nail down the relief.

I say to those who would like to see similar relief for other industries similarly affected that they would best serve that cause if they would help this industry to nail down its relief, because this would establish a precedent that would be helpful to them. By denying such relief by action on the floor of the Senate, we would set a precedent for a more liberal trade policy, not a trade policy that would grant more effective relief to industries similarly affected. If the textile industry is denied this relief, the Senate will have spoken on the liberal side of trade, not on the protectionist side of trade.

Mr. HRUSKA. Earlier this afternoon we heard the Senator from South Dakota carefully document the steps which have been taken and the efforts that have been made by other industries. This documentation is in the record. The record is very long indeed. We did not get into this fortuitous situation, perhaps because we did not give the proper knock at the proper door. The cotton industry has been able to get into a preferred post position at the race track, so we wished to make some progress at this time, because this is the opportune moment to do it. If we let this opportunity pass, we shall be under a great handicap at any later time, particularly if the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 is enacted. If agriculture receives the same treatment at that time as we are receiving here, we are going to be out in the cold forever and a day.

To ask that we fly the free trade flag and, at the same time, vote for this absolutely protectionist measure comes hard to those of us who are concerned about agricultural products which come within the scope of section 204. We see that the only chance we have under section 204 is slipping away with relief going to some but not to others. That is why we are insisting on making whatever progress we can.

Mr. MUSKIE. I believe the record will show—and I do not want to say anything that the record does not show—that I asked the Senator from South Dakota whether or not those who seek this relief had sought this particular form of relief in any negotiations under section 204. I believe he said that he understood that they had not.

My point is that the textile industry got the relief. They have traveled the road, and are in a position that will help all of us. If the textile agreements blow up, the precedent is of no effect, and they will go down the road that the peril-point cases have gone and the escape-clause cases have gone, which, as the Senator knows, have provided very little relief.

Mr. HRUSKA. No relief at all. As to whether the beef and lamb industries will ever avail themselves of this relief, the fact is that there is only one man who can grant it and implement it. There are in the statute no standards, no guidelines. So there is only one man who can do it under section 204,

and that is the man who occupies the office of President of the United States. If we had something to go by, that would be fine, but we do not.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the two tables—"Impact of Imports on the New England Shoe Industry" and "Impact of Imports on the Maine Shoe Industry"—be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IMPACT OF IMPORTS ON THE NEW ENGLAND SHOE INDUSTRY—FACT SHEET

1. Production: New England is the leading shoe producing region in the country.

| | New England | United States |
|-----------------------------|---------------|-----------------|
| 1961 | | |
| Shoe production: Pairs..... | 198,132,000 | 599,790,000 |
| Shoe shipments: Pairs..... | 193,739,000 | 598,127,000 |
| Value..... | \$777,736,000 | \$2,272,986,000 |

| | Percent |
|---|---------|
| Ratio of New England output to U.S. total..... | 33.0 |
| New England ratio of dollar shipments to U.S. shipments based on value..... | 34.2 |

2. Employment: 80,000 shoe workers; total employment 125,000 in Northeast.

| | New England | United States |
|--|-------------|---------------|
| 1961 | | |
| Shoe workers (number).... | 80,000 | 213,800 |
| Total employees in shoe, leather, and allied industries..... | 125,000 | 320,000 |

¹ Estimated.

3. Total wages of New England shoe workers estimated at \$716,077,000 in 1961.

4. Total imports of all footwear in 1961 reached 106,530,156 pairs, valued at \$125,856,258. This was equal to 15 percent of total U.S. footwear output of 730 million pairs.

5. Imports in 1961 of leather-type (non-rubber) footwear equaled 6.1 percent of U.S. output—and equaled 18.6 percent of New England volume.

6. Leather-type footwear imports have more than tripled in past 6 years—increase in past year was 38 percent.

7. Leather-type footwear imports in 1961 totaled 37 million pairs, valued at \$60 million. Imports were 10 million pairs in 1956, valued at \$18,300,000.

8. Shoe exports have been steadily declining in past 6 years—to a low in 1961 of 3,034,545 pairs valued at \$8,991,574.

U.S. footwear production versus imports, 1956-61

[In millions of pairs]

| | U.S. production | | | U.S. imports of footwear | | |
|--|-----------------|--------|-------|--------------------------|----------|--------------------|
| | Leather | Rubber | Total | Leather | Rubber | Total ¹ |
| 1961..... | 599.7 | 130.0 | 729.7 | 36.8 | 65.8 | 106.5 |
| 1960..... | 598.4 | 114.1 | 712.5 | 26.6 | 112.1 | 144.4 |
| 1959..... | 638.2 | 79.3 | 717.5 | 22.3 | 52.9 | 80.5 |
| 1958..... | 587.1 | 64.2 | 651.3 | 23.6 | 19.1 | 46.6 |
| 1957..... | 597.6 | 58.5 | 656.1 | 11.0 | 6.0 | 19.7 |
| 1956..... | 591.7 | 53.7 | 645.4 | 10.0 | 2.3 | 14.8 |
| Percent increase: | | | | | | |
| 1961-60..... | 0.2 | 17.0 | 2.4 | 38.3 | -41.3 | -26.2 |
| 1961-56..... | 1.35 | 142.1 | 13.1 | 268.0 | +2,760.9 | 119.6 |
| 1961 ratio, imports to production..... | | | | 6.1 | 50.6 | 14.6 |

¹ Includes imports of slipper socks.

IMPACT OF IMPORTS ON THE MAINE SHOE INDUSTRY—FACT SHEET

1. Production: Maine is the fifth most important shoe-producing State in the Nation.

1961: Shoe production, pairs, 46,848,000; shoe shipments, pairs, 47,123,000; value of shoe shipments (f.o.b. plant), \$173,818,000.

1961: Ratio of Maine production to U.S. total, 7.8 percent.

2. Employment: Shoe industry is the largest manufacturing employer in Maine.

1961:

| | |
|--|---------|
| Shoes (except rubber) manufacturing employees..... | 21, 100 |
| Tanning, leather, and leather products (except shoes)..... | 3, 100 |

Total..... 24, 200

3. Total wages paid to Maine shoe workers, 1961 (estimated), \$71 million.

4. Total 1961 U.S. shoe imports equal to 6 percent of U.S. shoe production and to 79 percent of Maine output.

[In pairs]

| | U.S. foreign trade in leather-type nonrubber shoes | | U.S. shoe production | Maine shoe production |
|-----------------------------|--|-------------|----------------------|-----------------------|
| | Imports | Exports | | |
| 1955..... | 7, 809, 654 | 4, 642, 134 | 585, 369, 000 | 48, 026, 000 |
| 1956..... | 9, 998, 939 | 4, 531, 470 | 591, 757, 000 | 49, 343, 000 |
| 1957..... | 10, 988, 477 | 4, 397, 638 | 597, 648, 000 | 49, 055, 000 |
| 1958..... | 23, 596, 541 | 4, 224, 648 | 587, 115, 000 | 50, 107, 000 |
| 1959..... | 22, 276, 841 | 3, 504, 712 | 637, 364, 000 | 54, 467, 000 |
| 1960..... | 26, 616, 508 | 3, 244, 316 | 598, 442, 000 | 51, 461, 000 |
| 1961..... | 36, 783, 815 | 3, 034, 645 | 599, 790, 000 | 46, 848, 000 |
| Percent change 1955-61..... | +471.0 | -34.6 | +2.5 | -2.5 |

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, this morning the New England delegation of Senators took special notice of the problems of the shoe industry in New England, particularly as it might be affected by the proposed Trade Expansion Act of 1962. Senator COTTON, of New Hampshire, and I were designated to serve as a special subcommittee of the delegation to examine the special problems of the shoe industry in relation to trade legislation.

I am convinced that steps must be taken to provide more adequate protection for the shoe industry and other industries against sudden disruptions in their markets from low wage producers in various areas of the world. The multilateral, voluntary agreement approach on import limitations is, to me, a practicable method of dealing with this problem. It has worked in cotton textiles; it can work for other industries.

That is why I introduced S. 1735, the Orderly Marketing Act, which would give the President the specific authority under our trade agreements program to enter into such voluntary import control arrangements.

My proposal would not destroy trade; it would provide a technique for adjusting trade to the long range benefit of both the exporting country and the importing country. It would help provide orderly development of markets.

I cannot resist drawing attention to that legislative proposal in the context of the one we are now considering, which in effect embraces the same principle.

ADMINISTRATION OF WILDLIFE REFUGES IN OREGON AND CALIFORNIA

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1345, S. 1988.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1988) to aid in the administration of the Tule Lake, Lower Klamath, and Upper Klamath National Wildlife Refuges in Oregon and California, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments, on page 2, at the beginning of line 9, to strike out "hereby dedicated to wildlife conservation, shall be administered by the Secretary of the Interior primarily for water fowl management purposes, and shall not be opened to homestead entry. The following public lands shall also be administered by the Secretary of the Interior primarily for waterfowl management purposes and shall not be opened" and insert "hereby dedicated to wildlife conservation, shall be administered by the Secretary of the Interior for the major purpose of waterfowl management, but with full consideration to optimum agricultural use that is consistent therewith. Such lands shall not be opened to homestead entry. The following public lands shall also be administered by the Secretary of the Interior for the major purpose of waterfowl management, but with full consideration to optimum agricultural use that is consistent therewith. Such lands shall not be opened to"; on page 3, after line 13, to strike out:

SEC. 3. Fifty cents per acre shall be paid on all reserved public lands lying within the Executive order boundaries of the Lower Klamath National Wildlife Refuge and the Tule Lake National Wildlife Refuge, to the counties within which such refuges are located, beginning with the fiscal year 1962: *Provided*, That the total annual payment per acre to each county shall not exceed three-fourths of the average per-acre tax levied on similar lands in private ownership in each county: *Provided further*, That no such payments shall be made which will reduce the contractual obligations of the United States with the Tulelake Irrigation District or the Klamath Drainage District.

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

SEC. 3. Subject to conditions hereafter prescribed, and pursuant to such regulations as may be issued by the Secretary, 25 percent of the net revenues collected during each fiscal year from the leasing of Klamath project reserved Federal lands within the Executive order boundaries of the lower Klamath National Wildlife Refuge and the Tule Lake National Wildlife Refuge shall be paid annually by the Secretary, without further authorization, for each full fiscal year after the date of this Act to the counties

in which such refuges are located, such payments to be made on a pro-rata basis to each county based upon the refuge acreage in each county: *Provided*, That the total annual payment per acre to each county shall not exceed 50 per centum of the average per acre tax levied on similar lands in private ownership in each county, as determined by the Secretary: *Provided further*, That no such payments shall be made which will reduce the credits or the payments to be made pursuant to contractual obligations of the United States with the Tulelake Irrigation District or the Klamath Drainage District, and the priority for the use of the net revenues shall be (1) to pay or credit to the Tulelake Irrigation District the amounts already committed to such payment or credit, and (2) to pay to the Klamath Drainage District the balance thereof until the sum of \$180,000 shall have been paid as full reimbursement for the construction of irrigation facilities to the lands involved.

On page 5, line 1, after "Sec. 4.", to strike out "The Secretary of the Interior shall retain in the Bureau of Reclamation or other bureau or agency within the Department of the Interior the full authority to lease the reserved public lands lying within the Executive order boundaries of the Lower Klamath and the Tule Lake National Wildlife Refuges." and insert "In carrying out the policy of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall retain full authority to lease for agricultural purposes the reserved public lands lying within the Executive order boundaries of the Lower Klamath and the Tule Lake National Wildlife Refuges."; after line 14, to strike out:

SEC. 5. The area of the water surface of the active sumps in the Klamath project lying within the Executive order boundaries of the Tule Lake National Wildlife Refuge shall not be reduced by diking or any other means to less than the existing thirteen thousand acres.

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

SEC. 5. The areas of sumps 1(a) and 1(b) in the Klamath project lying within the Executive order boundaries of the Tule Lake National Wildlife Refuge shall not be reduced by diking or by any other construction to less than the existing thirteen thousand acres.

And, on page 6, at the beginning of line 5, to strike out "so regulated as to provide the quantity necessary (1) to maintain sump levels, as established by contractual rules and regulations, in the Tule Lake National Wildlife Refuge, and (2) to maintain the ultimate development in the Upper and Lower Klamath National Wildlife Refuges which, in the judgment of the Secretary of the Interior, will provide biologically suitable habitat for waterfowl utilization" and insert "regulated, subject to valid existing rights, to maintain sump levels in the Tule Lake National Wildlife Refuge at levels established by contract and regulations pursuant thereto, which shall be levels that in the judgment of the Secretary are adequate and practicable for waterfowl management purposes."; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That it is hereby declared to be the policy of the Con-

living in makeshift tents, with a stream of newcomers on the way. It would be hard to imagine a foreign aid program launched under less promising circumstances. In the land of great miracles, one modest well-placed miracle would have been appreciated.

Now, 11 years later, this bilateral alliance, by mutual agreement, is being phased out. The Republic of Israel has reached that degree of economic maturity which with available loans and development funds it believes will enable it to stand on its own feet and cope with the economic challenges of the coming decade. Despite unusual economic, political, and social handicaps the joint program has fulfilled its purposes from the viewpoint both of the host country and our Nation.

What this mutual effort has achieved in Israel is of significance, not alone to all Americans, but to people of all emerging nations: it proves that foreign aid operations, whether as loans and development funds, or as grants and technical cooperation, in the right environment, and when properly conceived and soundly planned, when honestly, courageously, and effectively administered, can accomplish its intended purposes. It shows that there is a workable formula for such international cooperation, and, when these essential ingredients are present, that such cooperation can be an effective means to carry out domestic and foreign policies both of the donor and the recipient.

It has a second, perhaps even more significant aspect. American aid to Israel has triggered a chain reaction in international cooperation. The Republic of Israel already is doing for others what the people of America did for Israelis. This is the very essence, the ultimate goal of all international assistance between free nations: the spontaneous spread of the united effort to do away with the causes of hunger, disease, illiteracy, fear, and serfdom.

Not only are Israeli technicians being called to other countries to assist in basic development projects, but delegations from many nations have been going to Israel to find out what happened there, and what made it happen.

The knowledge and encouragement these visitors take home will do far more than gold or tractors or wheat to convince their people that the destiny of free peoples is indivisible. It is not difficult to imagine the electrifying impact on the free world should this chain reaction which began in Israel spark a similar flame in Africa and Asia, and in Latin America.

Nor is it difficult to foresee the consequences if such flame is not lighted, particularly in the Western Hemisphere. There is a compelling, challenging magnificence in the concept of the Alliance for Progress. Its fulfillment will depend, not so much on loans or development funds, essential as they may be, but on the integrity of purpose and the ability of North and Latin Americans, working as one, to awaken that rare spirit within human beings which creates this magic catalyst. The destiny of millions, the security of the Western Hemisphere—both will be influenced by the outcome.

Foreign aid is a highly specialized, volatile and limited means of implementing foreign policy. By its very nature, it must involve a simultaneous and voluntary person-to-person relationship from top levels of government to the smallest villages. It demands a new type of diplomacy, a new type of personnel, dedicated zealous men and women with special skills, with the ability to know what it means to be blinded by trachoma, living on the thin edge of starvation; men and women with the ability to say "we," not "I," and mean it, and so to share the aspirations and understand the hopes and fears of those whom they would help. It must have

people with courage to say "no," quietly, respectfully, and with patience, under pressure.

Experience has shown, by now, that such economic, political, and social entanglements, intimately interlacing the emotions and the destinies of nations, are not to be rushed into lightly, certainly not without meticulous joint preplanning covering each critical phase of the socioeconomic patterns of the host country. It also has demonstrated only too starkly, that a foreign aid program requires for its fulfillment certain imperative preconditions which must exist if there is to be the mutual confidence, the spirit and the will to carry through such a partnership.

The failure to insist on such plans and preconditions, to settle for less because of inexperience, or blackmail disguised as neutralism or as threats to seek help elsewhere, not only can discredit the total American foreign aid effort, and deliberately waste American resources, but be a disservice to those for whom the assistance is intended. Such ineptness is understandable but no longer tolerable.

What made it possible for the America/Israel alliance to reach its goals in little more than a decade? Among others, four preconditions were preeminent:

1. Prior to execution of the bilateral agreement, the Government of Israel gained the active support of its people. This it did by: (a) telling them that it intended to request American technical assistance and economic aid; (b) by outlining the general purposes for which this aid, if granted, would be used; (c) by assuring them that operations would be joint i.e. a partnership in which both countries, as equals, would have a stake; and (d) by warning that the venture would require that Israelis meet, dollar for dollar, the costs of technical aid, which meant that they would have to tighten their belts even tighter.

With minor exceptions, and despite some 17 political parties, there has been close cooperation between Israelis and their government, and by both with their American counterparts. Without this unity, the program could not have been fully implemented, no matter how large the dollar component.

2. Prior to execution of the bilateral agreement, the Government of Israel, and other national leaders, convinced our Government that Israel could absorb and honestly desired to use American aid to build in the Middle East a viable democratic nation, a valid republic affiliated with the United Nations and committed to the community of free nations.

Time and bitter experience have shown that this precondition is indispensable for the success of any American-aid program. It can be one of the most difficult to realize. In this respect, the Republic of Israel had an advantage: it was a new nation, not an old one wallowing in centuries of stagnation. It was not dominated by a small entrenched elite, a fossilized hierarchy, with its horde of bureaucrats, bent on perpetuating its status quo, which had to be converted, or eliminated, before any help could prove beneficial. Dollars poured in at the top seldom "trickle down" through such a barrier to effect needed reforms.

Those charged with administering American foreign aid frequently are faced with this dilemma: which shall come first, aid to effect reforms, or reforms to make it possible for aid to work? This question demands, not a prosaic choice, but a delicate complex judgment.

It is traditional American policy, as contrasted with infiltration and subversion, in recognizing the sovereignty of any nation to deal with its people through its government in power.

If such leaders are unwilling or unable to create conditions under which American assistance can gain its real objectives, then, except in those rare instances when the security of America may justify such a calculated risk, wisdom dictates against commitment of American resources to an alliance fraught with discord, bribery, bloody revolt, and almost certain diversion of American aid against itself.

3. Prior to execution of the bilateral agreement, the objectives for which the proposed assistance was to be used were charted with deliberate care. The guiding principles so laid down by mutual approval, in the beginning, have carried through to the end of the program and account for much of its progress. They provided coordinated action, made it possible, step by step, simultaneously to move forward in nine critical areas of Israel's economy, ranging from food production to national financial management. Important as were economic considerations, these plans were predicated on the assumption that Israel's greatest asset was its people, and that human aspirations are not measurable with a slide rule.

As a result, there was no need for crash programs in Israel. The Israelis understood the need to build from the bottom, soundly, and realized that they would have to eat less, work harder and wait until the newly planted citrus, olives and carob trees could bear, the dams and reservoirs could be built, and water developed for irrigation. And, by mutual assistance, there were strings on every project, specific plans to make certain that time, manpower and resources were used only for indispensable deliberated schemes which could be understood and completed. As a consequence, there were no half-finished schools, hospitals without equipment or factories without walls.

4. The Government of Israel, and its people, committed their total resources: moral, spiritual, and material, to the achievement of the ultimate goals envisaged by the Alliance. This precondition is mandatory in any justified foreign aid program. No nation, actually interested in helping its people, should hesitate to dedicate its full strength to this end. There is no place in a binational aid program for "squirreling" public or private funds, or policies under which a few continue to live in luxury in the midst of misery, while people of other nations are asked to share their earnings.

This complete dedication by the Israelis left no place for discrimination. In the early years, when a shipload of wheat failed to reach Haifa on schedule, everyone was without bread: the Prime Minister in Jerusalem as well as the shepherd grazing his flocks in the wadis of the Negev. From the highest levels of government, to the lowliest fisherman off Ein Gev on the Sea of Galilee, the men, women, and children of Israel, sharing the same hardships, enjoying the same exhilaration with each step forward, committed themselves to the task of building a new nation in which coming generations will live in full freedom.

In a world shaken by revolt, seeking change, Israel is spreading an idea, a highly revolutionary idea for most people on earth, the idea which can exert a most powerful influence around the globe, the same idea which sparked America's fight for freedom: government only by consent of the governed, and an enlightened economic and social development to preserve that freedom.

Today, on the occasion of the 14th anniversary of the Republic of Israel, we salute its people for their faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, and for the spirit which has impelled them, so soon, to do for others what has been done for them.

Soon will end a decade of dramatic cooperation between one of the oldest and one

of the youngest republics of our time: the United States of America and the Republic of Israel. What has been done is there to be seen, a refreshing, perhaps prophetic bit of history in an open book for those who care, and those who dare to read its pages. The people of both nations justly may be proud of what they have built, working together, as freemen.

AMENDMENT OF THE AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10788) to amend section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The pending business is House bill 10788; and the pending question is on agreeing to the Mundt amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the so-called Mundt amendment. The substitute is proposed by me, on behalf of myself and the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

The amendment of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] would, as we know, proscribe action on cotton unless certain nonrelated agreements were reached on beef, lamb, poultry, timber, and other products. Our substitute would treat each product on its own merits. It would direct similar action by the President. For this reason, I would vote to defeat the Mundt amendment, and to substitute a more constructive approach. The Humphrey-Morse amendment will direct the President to limit exports from foreign countries on the commodities listed in the amendment when such imports seriously affect domestic producers.

In other words, the safeguards required for domestic producers are provided by statutory law; and we leave the judgment as to the protection of domestic producers to the discretion of the President, who has the responsibility, under the Trade Acts, to negotiate agreements which are reciprocal and which protect and defend the economic and the political interests of the United States.

Mr. President, I send to the desk the amendment in the nature of a substitute, and ask that it be printed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the table; and at this time the amendment will be stated.

The amendment submitted by Mr. HUMPHREY, on behalf of himself and Mr. MORSE, was read, as follows:

In lieu of the amendment submitted by Mr. MUNDT, on behalf of himself and certain other Senators, insert:

“Provided, however, That in addition to agreements in regard to cotton and cotton textiles the President shall negotiate agreements with representatives of foreign nations limiting in like manner the export to the United States from foreign countries to the following commodities: beef and beef products, pork and pork products, fresh and frozen lamb, poultry and poultry products,

dairy products, timber and timber products, when in his judgment such imports seriously affect domestic producers.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I do not intend to debate this substitute amendment tonight. I understand that tomorrow the Senate will be operating under the time limitation under the unanimous-consent agreement which has been entered into.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. At that time I shall call up my substitute amendment, for consideration.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nebraska will state it.

Mr. HRUSKA. Under the agreement previously entered into, are all amendments on this score before the Senate to be voted upon serially; or just what is the situation? Will the amendment in the nature of a substitute displace the Mundt amendment, or will it be voted on in its proper order, together with such other amendments as may be proposed?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. They will be voted on according to their preferential standing when offered.

Under the agreement, the debate is under the control of the Senator from Louisiana and the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. HRUSKA. But if additional amendments are offered or if additional amendments in the nature of a substitute are offered, they are to be voted on in order, commencing at the hour of 2:30 tomorrow afternoon, are they not? Is that correct?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Amendments in the second degree are pending now, and the first vote will come on the substitute for the amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

Mr. HRUSKA. What about additional amendments in the nature of a substitute?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. No further amendment is in order until the substitute has been disposed of. After that is disposed of, another can be offered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In other words, Mr. President, do I correctly understand that the pending question will be on agreeing to the amendment offered by me, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], it being an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the Mundt amendment?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. And if our amendment is adopted—and we certainly hope it will be—the Senate will then vote on the Mundt amendment as substituted for by the Humphrey-Morse amendment?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Yes, as amended by the Humphrey-Morse amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

If our amendment should be rejected, then the Mundt amendment would be open to amendment, would it not?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Then the first vote to be taken tomorrow, in connection with the Mundt amendment, will be on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, which a moment ago I offered on behalf of myself and the Senator from Oregon; is that correct?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, at this time I wish to comment on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, submitted a moment ago by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], as its author, and also in my behalf, as its co-sponsor.

In connection with the amendment to the Agricultural Act of 1956, Mr. President—I refer to House bill 10788—the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] has offered an amendment which would require that before agreements are enforced on cotton and cotton textiles, the President must negotiate agreements with foreign nations limiting the export to the United States of beef, pork, lamb, poultry, dairy, and timber products.

I appreciate the basis on which this amendment is offered; but its adoption would not produce the benefits sought for any of these products, including cotton and cotton textiles.

I would support an amendment directing action on each of the enumerated products independently.

As I have stated, I have been pleased to join with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] in the submission of the amendment in the nature of a substitute which he has offered. I believe it to be a very sound amendment.

When the bill was before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, my colleague [Mrs. NEUBERGER] raised the question of whether the Agriculture Act of 1956 included timber. I believe it was with great insight and foresight that she raised that question.

The committee concluded, on the basis of a letter from the General Counsel of the Department of Agriculture, that forestry is a part of agriculture and that timber is an agricultural commodity. Therefore, the act permits the President to take appropriate action on timber and timber products, when in his judgment such action is both necessary and desirable.

In other words, from the standpoint of the power of the President, we really do not need any amendment, insofar as timber is concerned, although I wish to make perfectly clear that I shall welcome an opportunity to vote for any agreement which is entered into in regard to timber, separate and distinct from agreements in regard to other products; and in a moment I shall state my reasons for my preference for that approach.

In this connection the Mundt amendment, as it applies to timber, is unnecessary; all it does is forestall action on tex-

ties until some action is taken on timber and other agricultural commodities.

Therefore, Mr. President, I believe that the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] meets the issue neither squarely nor properly.

I believe that the amendment in the nature of a substitute, which has been offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], does meet this issue squarely.

Now I wish to say a few words about the parliamentary effect of the Mundt amendment, as I see its potentialities.

First, let us note the items listed in the Mundt amendment, namely, beef, pork, lamb, poultry, dairy, and timber products. But note what the amendment proposes to do. It proposes that before any textile agreement can be negotiated with other nations, there must also be negotiated an agreement in regard to all the other items—not separately, but all of them.

I say most respectfully and kindly that that creates great parliamentary complications for the Senate, for these various items are all in difficulty in our economy. There is difficulty over the importations of beef, pork, lamb, wool, poultry, dairy, and timber products.

I come from a great timber producing State, so I suppose it would be taken for granted that I would rush in to support any amendment offered on the floor of the Senate that even mentioned the word "timber." There are those who say the Senator from Oregon would have a difficult time explaining why he does not do so, since the timber industry is having difficulty. Hearings are in progress. What will be the final field hearing will be held in Portland on June 4th. The hearings are solely and directly on the serious plight in which the timber industry finds itself because of Canadian competition. Many of us feel it is unfair Canadian competition in many respects, and that there is a duty on the part of the Government to take necessary steps to come to the assistance of the timber industry of the Pacific Northwest. But, Mr. President, in my judgment, I do not help the timber industry or the lumbermen of my State by rallying to the support of an amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota which, in my opinion, would bog down any possibility of obtaining any agreement on anything.

The first thing to do, in my judgment, is to go forward with the textile agreement. Already we have gone a long way with the administration in making progress on an agreement in regard to textiles.

I am perfectly willing to be of assistance in voting for a measure that provides for an agreement, particularly when such measure contains the language which, as I have already made clear, would permit the President to take appropriate action with respect to timber and timber products. We do not need the Mundt amendment in order to permit the President to take action with relation to timber.

I say to the timber industry of the State of Oregon that not a single one of our lumbermen need have any doubt as

to whether or not the two Senators from Oregon have been diligent in finding a solution, for we have made clear to our President the seriousness of the situation as it involves Oregon.

If the Mundt amendment is adopted, we shall have no agreement on textiles, beef, pork, lumber, or poultry, because they are all combined, and the provision would say, in effect, that, "You cannot have one without all." In my judgment, the possibility of obtaining all those agreements in time to provide the relief we need, is practically nil.

Furthermore, we have an opportunity to set a precedent with respect to textiles. We have the facts on textiles. The facts on timber are being supplied in part in the hearings being held by the Commerce Committee. It would be a great mistake to have the Mundt amendment thrown into the situation as a part of the legislative process, because it would produce a dilatory action in connection with all products. It would have the effect of defeating the legitimate purpose of the pending bill. I have no doubt of the legitimate objectives of the Senator from South Dakota, but this is not the way to accomplish those objectives.

So I join the Senator from Minnesota in the substitute he offers, because his substitute would provide for adequate procedure. We will approve the textile agreement. We have an amendment that makes it perfectly clear that the President should proceed to give protection to other industries when it can be shown that irretrievable injury would be caused without such protection. I think it is a constructive way to approach the problem.

I shall not be present tomorrow, because I must leave on the midnight plane to be in Oregon tomorrow for the primary, but I shall return on Sunday. The leadership has said it will do its best to obtain a live pair for me on the Mundt amendment, the Humphrey amendment, and the bill itself.

I want the record to show this before I leave, because I know how this information can be misused and the results made misleading unless I make the situation very clear before I leave. I want to make it very clear to the lumber interests of my State that I am opposing the Mundt amendment because, in my judgment, it would work against the best interests of the lumber industry of my State. In my judgment, the adoption of the Humphrey substitute amendment is a proper way.

It would serve clear notice on the President as to the intention of Congress and that when we come forth with the documentation and evidence, the President should give us some support at the executive level and be of assistance in order to meet problems being created by Canada through various types of assistance their lumber interests are getting from their Government and the various advantages they enjoy in competing with the lumber mills of the Pacific Northwest. We are asking, in part, that something be done in regard to the rail transit system, whereby our Canadian lumbermen have an advantage in being permitted to hold box cars loaded with lumber free of charge

for 2 weeks, whereas in the United States the Interstate Commerce Commission has denied this right to our lumber producers.

The lumber interests of my State do not have to worry over what the two Senators from Oregon and the members of our State delegation in the House, Mrs. Green, and Mr. Ullman, are doing. They are working to get executive action to protect the legitimate rights of our lumbermen. But I will not go along with the Mundt amendment, because I am satisfied that, although it is pleasant sounding in its phrases, in my judgment it would be most ineffectual in its results, whereas the Humphrey amendment would produce the results we need.

The bill itself, with the Humphrey amendment added to it, would be the best way to serve the interests of the industries enumerated in the Mundt amendment.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have the floor.

Mr. HRUSKA. Will the Senator yield for a question? He is the author of the amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator may direct a question to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. HRUSKA. Let me direct the question to either Senator.

Would the Humphrey amendment add anything to the powers conferred on the President by the present section 204?

Mr. MORSE. I think it very clearly would add a direction to the President, and a direction is always a good legislative process.

Mr. HRUSKA. It is a direction to him when, in his judgment, imports seriously affect domestic producers. So it is still within his full discretion.

Mr. MORSE. What does the Senator from Nebraska think the Mundt amendment would add to the President's power?

Mr. HRUSKA. It would subtract from his powers until such time as he effects agreement in all these categories.

Mr. MORSE. It would take from his power and would not protect a single industry. In the present act we set the precedent for protecting the textile industry. We begin with textiles. We are well on our way in negotiations on textiles. I am sure the Senator knows what is going to happen on the floor of the Senate if Senators are to be put in a position of following a course of action that makes it impossible for the President to get meritorious agreements that ought to be made, unless the President can simultaneously secure like agreements for the other industries that can show a need for equally meritorious protection.

Mr. HRUSKA. If the amendment still leaves discretionary power in the President, the Senator from Nebraska does not see that it adds anything to section 204. If there is some way in which it does, I should certainly like to be enlightened.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The addition to the President's authority is only that of congressional intent. There would be

a direction by the Congress that the President shall, when he finds imports seriously affect or impair the particular producers of the commodities listed, stop the importation of those commodities which are listed in the amendment. The President would be so directed.

Mr. HRUSKA. But the President has that power under the peril point and escape clause provisions now, does he not; together with the totally unrestricted power under section 204, which reads in part:

The President may * * * negotiate with representatives of foreign governments in an effort to obtain agreements limiting the export from such countries and the importation into the United States of any agricultural commodity or product manufactured therefrom or textiles or textile products.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. HRUSKA. His power is total, absolute, and unrestricted. It would add nothing to the act or to the President's power if Congress were only to say the President shall negotiate agreements when he thinks domestic producers are being seriously affected. That would add absolutely nothing.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think the addition would be that the Congress is fully aware these commodities which are listed in the amendment could be seriously affected by excessive imports. If they are, and if the President in his judgment finds such to be the case, the President would be directed by the Congress to take the same action in respect to those commodities as he is to take in respect to textiles. Each commodity would be considered on its own merits, rather than in some kind of legislative smorgasbord, which is exactly what the Mundt amendment provides. It gathers in any and all gripes, any and all problems, rumored or in fact, puts them in one amendment and says: "Mr. President, despite what you have done in the negotiations in respect to textiles on the basis of evidence, on the basis of need, and on the basis of the national interest, you must tie this into a package including all other commodities, even though the evidence may not demonstrate those other commodities are being seriously injured. All of them must be tied in together, and if you cannot do that, Mr. President, you cannot do anything."

I say that would be restrictive legislation which I think would violate the intent of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act itself. I think it would be a backing up from where we were once before, by an act of Congress. I think it leaves textiles and other industries with no protection at all unless action could be taken for all the other products.

I think it would also be bad legislation not only in terms of its impact but also in terms of its language, with reference to the processes which would be established.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I completely agree with the Senator from Minnesota. I would put it this way: The Mundt amendment would add nothing to the President's power, and it would give us no assurance

that there would be any agreement in respect to pork, lamb, timber or the other products mentioned. Furthermore, as the Senator from Minnesota has pointed out, it seeks to require the President to negotiate agreements on these other commodities irrespective of what the evidence may be, and with entirely different groups of nations.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Exactly.

Mr. MORSE. We must not forget that other nations are involved in timber products then may be involved in beef or timber.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. MORSE. As I stated, great progress has been made already in respect to the textile agreement. What would be done by the Humphrey amendment is to direct the President to take note of any industry in which irreparable injury is being done, and to seek to negotiate an agreement if the facts warrant it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is exactly the case.

Mr. MORSE. Lastly, if the Mundt amendment were agreed to, I think it would result in no agreements at all. The textile agreement would be thrown out, along with all the work which has been done in reference to textiles. In my judgment, it would create a very bad situation for achieving any legitimate protection for industries genuinely in need.

Let us be frank about this. It would be said that this was some kind of bargaining or trading proposition being offered, irrespective of the facts.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Of course.

Mr. MORSE. Senators supporting the textile industry have come to the Senate to say, "We have offered our case. We are ready to prove our case. We ask for approval of the agreement."

I want to be in a position to come to the Senate to make out the same case with respect to timber and, if I can prove the case—and I think I can—I hope to be able to obtain similar action.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think we could add lead, zinc, and iron ore, even though one cannot call those agricultural commodities, because there is no rule of germaneness in this body. One could add almost anything.

Mr. HRUSKA. That would be all right.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Nebraska in his comments is suggesting that if any Senator has in mind any commodity which anybody says is in trouble we should put it on the list, put it on the bill of fare, put it on the legislative menu—"The only way you can have anything to eat is to eat it all."

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is said, "If you want to sit down at this table, take the whole menu, from top to bottom." That is what the Senator from Nebraska would say.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. The Senator from Minnesota is anticipating the argument. We shall not come to a consideration of

that question until H.R. 9900 is before the Senate. On that score, if the bill contains then what it contains now, including bestowing virtually absolute power on the President, the Senator from Nebraska will oppose it and oppose it vigorously, because he does not believe that the President or any other person in America should exercise so much power without limitations prescribed by the Congress.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Congress has prescribed plenty of limitations. The Congress of the United States has provided a limitation that these things cannot be done unless the President finds it is in the national interest. The President cannot make these agreements if he finds, for example, that such agreements would be injurious to the domestic producers. That is plenty of limitation.

What is really being said, though not in so many words, to get it out on the table, is, "We don't trust the President. We don't trust his judgment."

The President of the United States will use the facilities of this Government to ascertain whether or not there is a national injury. I think he will do the right thing. I do not wish to be put in the position of preventing passage of much-needed legislation relating to the textile industry, even though there is not a single textile plant in the State of Minnesota. That industry obviously has problems. Its problems have been analyzed.

Negotiations are underway toward agreements which will be helpful to this country. They will not be injurious to other producers. Agreements have been arrived at, after diplomatic negotiations. I think this is the proper way to proceed, considering the merits of the question and the merits of the commodity involved.

This is exactly what the Humphrey-Morse amendment would do. I believe, if it is necessary to have an amendment to the bill, that the substitute proposed offers the sensible process, and I think it offers the more equitable way of proceeding.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In the campaign of 1880 the Democratic candidate for the Presidency, Winfield Scott Hancock, remarked that "the tariff is a local issue." He was laughed to scorn for that statement. But the proceedings of the last few months and the discussion tonight in the Senate indicate that General Hancock knew about the tariff.

The President and the large part of the country on the one hand are trying to lower tariffs as an inducement to get other countries to lower their tariffs to expand the total area of international trade. They are doing this because they believe in the advantages of the international division of labor, that a broader market will stimulate a greater division of labor and will break down national cartels and monopolies. I agree with this general purpose, and I intend to support it.

The administration faces certain political difficulties which have become clearly apparent. The glass industry says, "We will be hurt." The carpet industry says, "We will be hurt." So, in order to placate the glass industry and the carpet industry, the President raises the tariffs on those two products in the hope of getting Representatives and Senators from those areas to vote for the trade expansion bill.

The textile industry, along with the steel industry, has been one of the two great centers of protectionism in this country. The textile mills of New England were protectionist from the very beginning. As a matter of fact, they financed the Republican Party and furnished the driving force for a large section of the Republican Party.

That was true of the textile industries in Pennsylvania. In the past our southern friends have been low tariff advocates and broad traders because they exported raw cotton. Now, however, the textile mills have moved in large part out of New England and into the Piedmont region, which stretches from Danville, Va., to Birmingham, Ala. As the textile mills have moved South, they have carried with them the protectionist sentiment.

I well remember when the Reciprocal Trade Act of 1955 was passed in the House of Representatives by only one or two votes. On that occasion every Representative from the South or the Piedmont region voted against the Reciprocal Trade Act.

As realists we are all more or less familiar with what has happened. The textile industry is a powerful industry. Senators and Representatives represent textile districts in New England, the Middle States, and now the Southern States as well. In order to placate them and get them to support trade expansion, the Department of State and the Department of Commerce negotiated agreements with the European Economic Community and with other areas. I do not know the full details. On the whole they have done a pretty good job because, as I understand, the European countries have agreed to take more textiles from Hong Kong, so that we will be required to take less, or proportionately less.

Nevertheless, as tacticians, the administration made at least three successive concessions to protectionist sentiment in order to get the bill passed.

Now our good friend the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] has come forward with a proposal to include in the bill the livestock, dairy, and timber industries. Where is this process to stop? The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has said that he wants to take care of Oregon timber, I suppose, against the competition of British Columbia timber?

The Senator from Maine implied that the shoe industry is in trouble. The shoe industry started in New England close to where the distinguished Presiding Officer, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SMITH], now lives. I believe Lynn was the original center of the shoe industry. The shoe industry

has gone west as the textile industry, in part, has gone south. St. Louis is now the center of the shoe industry, with Brown Shoe and International Shoe having their headquarters in that city. Shoe factories are scattered over the State of Illinois. So shoes will come in. If we make concessions to shoes, other industries will line up at the lunch counter. We can be quite certain of that.

The coal industry is a very important industry. I think it has been treated rather badly by Germany. We can lay down coal at the mouth of the Rhine and sell it at prices less than the German prices. But Germany will let in from outside countries only 6 million tons a year, of which we are permitted to bring in 5 million tons. Germany has refused to raise the quota. The coal industry is asking for more severe restrictions upon the importation of residual fuel.

Constant complaints have been received from those in the flatware industry in Illinois. They say they are being menaced by flatware competition from Japan, and ask whether something can be done for them. I have fought them off thus far with the statement that we should consider the general interest of the country.

Illinois is a large producer of bicycles. Bicycles have been suffering from English competition.

The point is that once we start making concessions and trading, and once we start buying off local opposition, however necessary it may be, we weaken the general position.

It is notorious that I am not a skillful political tactician.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. What was the Senator's margin in the last election?

Mr. DOUGLAS. 437,000.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I must say, "What skill."

Mr. DOUGLAS. The people of my State have been very kind to me—much more kind than I deserve. I can only say on the floor of the Senate that I recognize that I am not a skilled tactician. I understand the motives of everyone. I have no criticism of anyone. I only say that if we start trading commodity after commodity, we shall lose the general principle. A halt must be called somewhere.

The President may have made a mistake with respect to the glass and carpet industries, because his action has evoked outcries from Belgium. Belgium is considering retaliatory measures on commodities because we are hitting some of their major industries.

I am not going to preach to my colleagues on this subject. The situation reminds me of Rip Van Winkle. Rip Van Winkle swore off intoxicating liquors, but whenever a drink appeared he would say, "We won't count this time."

It is very easy to send the general principle down the river in order to make a little local conciliation. How long can I hold out when people say to me, "Glass is protected. Carpets are protected. Cotton is going to be protected. Wool is going to be protected. Beef, pork, and

lamb," we produce at least the first two of those commodities in large quantities, "butter, cheese, and timber," we do not have much timber, "must we always be at the end of the line?"

Mr. HUMPHREY. I come from a State that has timber, beef, and dairy products in large amounts. I am not asking that they be blanketed in under any protection. I think all these matters must be judged on their merits. Basically, I support the trade expansion bill, and feel that the national interest and agricultural interest will be better served by its enactment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am disposed to agree with the Senator from Minnesota. I have no fault to find with the administration. I have no fault to find with the Senator from South Dakota or the Senator from Nebraska. I think they are merely doing what others have done. What we face in the Senate is that the textile group is a very powerful group, centered not only in New England and the Middle States, but also in the Southern States. In a very genteel fashion they have held a pistol at the head of the President and said, "There will be no trade expansion bill unless you take care of cotton and wool." I suppose that is exactly what happened, and under that pressure the poor man could not hold out.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. Is the Senator suggesting that the timber interests, the cattle interests, the pork interests, and the lamb interests are unharmed, and therefore our interests will not be considered in the preferred class that can be helped by the President under the provisions of section 204? On the other hand, the cotton interests, being a little more potent politically and having a pistol, are getting what they want. If so, the issue before the Congress now is the question whether we can summon enough power here to do something which will assure our people of enjoying the same treatment given the cotton interests.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think we should differentiate between the dead-eye aim of the pistol, which picks a particular target, and coming through with a mallet and catching what one can find.

Mr. HRUSKA. On the contrary—

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am not happy with what happened with respect to glass.

In fact, I wrote to the State Department about glass and carpets. For example, immediately after tariffs were raised on glass, prices went up immediately on glass products. I did not care for that. I wrote to the Department and expressed my concern about it. I wrote to the Department of Commerce and the Department of State. They gave me some information which somewhat disabused my mind of certain misconceptions. But I feel that the policy is one which can lend itself to abuse.

I think we all recognize that in the legislative processes we seldom get the perfect instrument.

We are seeking through the trade expansion bill to give the President the basic authority to be able to sit at the conference table of economic and trade negotiations with enough flexibility for the adjustment of tariffs and duties so that our negotiators and the President will be able to provide us with the best package that is available under the terms of the agreement.

I hope that this will be the case. I should very much dislike to see the legislation loaded down with any more exemptions and exceptions.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to make this brief comment on the observations of the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Minnesota. We are dealing here with both a definitive problem and also with a matter of degree. I have made some inquiries and have done some book work on this subject. I do not understand that this textile agreement is satisfactory to the textile industry of this country or to the textile industry of some of the other countries. It is not an agreement that eliminates what many of the textile manufacturers of this country feel is an injury. We have a definitive problem as to whether the agreement meets what I believe we ought to work for; namely, the elimination of irreparable injury to an industry. That does not mean the elimination of all injury.

I wish to make it clear that I will support the trade program of the President so far as the objectives are concerned. I am certainly not going to take the position that all possible injury that may result to some industry must be eliminated before I will vote for the bill. We cannot have that kind of guarantee and meet the international trade problems that confront the country. There will have to be some give and take.

As the Senator from Illinois has pointed out, there have been negotiations at the international conference table with respect to textiles. It looks as though this might be a fair and conscientious compromise of the economic differences.

There is the Hong Kong matter, to which the Senator from Illinois has referred. There are other concessions made by other countries as well as by our own country.

As to glass, I am afraid that there is probably some reason to believe that the negotiators went too far, that they sought to protect the industry from any and all injury. I do not buy that.

Let me make clear my position with regard to timber. I am not asking to put the American timber industry in the situation where it will put the Canadian timber industry out of business. That is not my approach to this problem. I am seeking to eliminate certain unfair discriminations that our own Government is practicing upon the timber industry, namely, the transit problem to which I referred earlier. We cannot

possibly justify the present policy of the Interstate Commerce Commission in forbidding a small lumber mill operator to put his lumber, which he expects to sell in New York City, into a freight car at Roseburg, Oreg., and start the lumber for New York, as is the case with someone in British Columbia, who can do that on the Canadian Railroad, and get what we have been talking about, a rolling storehouse for the lumber while it moves to market, while negotiations for its sale are under way.

That is discrimination against the lumbermen of our country. I want the executive department to do something.

The same thing applies in the timber industry with regard to certain advantages that the Canadians have in the shipping of their timber.

I have been heard to say that I support the Magnuson proposal, of which I am a cosponsor, and that the part of the Jones Act which discriminates against our lumbermen ought to be eliminated, at least in the sense that the Government, and not our lumbermen, will pay the subsidy.

If we make them ship in American bottoms, in order to have available an efficient merchant marine in time of war, our lumbermen should not be placed at a disadvantage with Canadian lumber mills, who do not encounter that situation. It is this type of elimination of injury that I am referring to. It is the elimination of irreparable injury, not the elimination of all injury that I favor.

It is unfair to permit this kind of injury in the lumber industry to continue.

The Humphrey amendment would make it possible for the President to proceed to eliminate that kind of injury without our building a high tariff wall. I am against that, whether it is for timber, textiles, glass, or anything else. I think it will take time to adjust this kind of trade policy. We cannot proceed all at once.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I have completed my statement.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Common Market trade policy on agriculture will not be consummated in terms of a unified tariff and duty structure for the Common Market countries until 1969, which is 7 years from now.

Mr. MORSE. We are buying time.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not wish to prolong this discussion, because the hour is late, and I know that Senators, including myself, wish to make insertions in the Record.

It is true that the Humphrey-Morse amendment is not as bad as the Mundt proposal, and it is probably the best way of dealing with the situation at this time.

However, it would be a great temptation for all of us to sacrifice general principle for specific, local interests, and specific commodity interests. The more we sacrifice the general interest for the local interest, the greater the pressure will be upon others to demand similar privileges for themselves. Those who consider the international interest usually come out at the little end of the

horn. That is the purpose of what I was trying to say today.

Adam Smith once declared that there were two ways of getting a general reduction in tariffs by a number of countries. One was for one country to lead off, reducing its tariffs, in the hope that other countries will reduce their tariffs. The other is for a country to threaten to increase its tariff unless the other countries reduce theirs.

The present trade expansion bill gives the President the first set of powers, but not the second set of powers, except under some obscure sections of the existing law.

I spent about a month in Europe last fall, interviewing the German Minister of Economics, Mr. Erhardt, and responsible persons in Bonn, Brussels, Paris, and London. I came to the conclusion that the Common Market will not for a long time give much of a break to American agriculture. We must look forward, in all probability, to a diminishing market in Europe in wheat, feed grains, soybean oil, frozen chickens, tobacco, and a number of other products.

I believe that one of our problems will be to minimize this loss. I have reached the tentative conclusion that we stand a better chance to minimize this loss if we give the President the power to increase tariffs, provided the increases have for their sole purpose obtaining reductions in the tariffs of other countries, or if he threatens to increase the tariffs.

I hope that he will never be compelled to use the powers. I do not want to start off a retaliatory tariff war. I do not want to put the President in a position where the protectionist pressures upon him will be insurmountable. However, I have come to the conclusion that a mere offer of reciprocal reductions will not be sufficient to sway the tariff policies of Germany and France. Therefore, it is much better for the President to go to the bargaining table with something in his hind pocket, which he will not take out and brandish, but which our European friends will know is there.

So it is my present intention, unless I am convinced that this is wrong, to offer such an amendment at the appropriate time, either in the Committee on Finance or on the floor of the Senate. I throw up this trial balloon really in order that the question may be more fully discussed by those who read the Record. But this is not the time to expand on that.

I yield the floor, because I believe other Senators desire to make statements and insertions in the Record.

A SOUND HEALTH PROGRAM FOR AMERICA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, yesterday it was my privilege to speak before the Group Health Association in Washington. In my address I outlined the progress the Congress has made in health legislation in the 87th Congress and gave a review of the administration's comprehensive health program.

This far-reaching program includes such measures as liberalization of certain provisions of the Hill-Burton Act

about \$80,000 in savings deposits, earning 4 percent, to receive \$3,199 in interest.

An elderly couple with full social security benefits and \$1,000 more than this in interest income—\$4,199 a year—would, however, fall into the much-discussed over-withheld category. Their savings deposits would have to total about \$105,000. The withholding each quarter would be \$210—\$160 more than necessary. Under the quarterly refund procedure, the couple would never be out of pocket more than \$160, which is the first quarter's overwithholding. The quarterly refund from the first quarter would offset the overwithholding in the second quarter and so on indefinitely. This \$160 would earn only about \$6 for an entire year if left in their savings account at 4 percent.

How can anyone say this is hardship? Such a couple is well-to-do by almost anyone's standards—and there are very few such couples. Most elderly people would not be subject to withholding at all.

The amounts overwithheld generally will not be large. For more than half the people entitled to refunds, the amount overwithheld will be less than \$10 per year. The average refund of overwithheld wages and salaries, in contrast, is \$143—and wage and salary earners can collect their refunds only at the end of the year.

Withholding is necessary. A total of nearly \$4 billion in dividends and interest—nearly 20 percent of the total—goes unreported on tax returns each year. Publicity campaigns aimed at increasing voluntary reporting have simply not worked. Internal Revenue has no way of checking many evasions, especially on interest payments, because only the large ones—\$600 or more—have to be reported by the payors to the Government.

Withholding will pay for itself many times over. The estimated administrative cost of the withholding system is \$19 million per year but \$650 million in presently evaded taxes will be collected. Use of withholding to eliminate the many small and frequently unintentional evasions will free Internal Revenue agents to pursue the upper income bracket evasions which account for the difference between the \$800 million in tax receipts now being lost and the \$650 million withholding will bring in. These well-to-do evaders will, of course, be withheld 20 percent like everyone else—but they owe more than that.

Use of ADP, the suggested alternative to withholding, would cost more to do one-third of the job. Automatic data processing does not collect one penny in taxes. All it does is identify suspected tax evaders, who then have to be located and audited. Following up and auditing all evaders turned up by ADP would be literally impossible—there are 6 million taxpayers who have interest and dividend income and don't report any of it. At least an equal number—maybe more—report some, but not all, of their dividend and interest income. Just follow up the biggest evaders, to recover \$200 million in taxes, would cost the Government \$29 million—half again the price of a withholding system that would collect more than three times that amount. The maximum additional tax that the Internal Revenue Service could collect effectively with ADP and a reasonable enforcement effort is \$200 million. And even to accomplish only the \$200 million increase in tax receipts would require an increase of over 3,000 in Internal Revenue's enforcement staff—a 55 percent jump in the number of office auditors presently employed and a 10 percent rise in the number of agents. In addition, use of ADP and enforcement personnel followups would require that business organizations make much more detailed and numerous reports

to Internal Revenue than they do now—or would have to do under withholding. In addition, there is no ADP system fully in operation as of now—and won't be until 1966.

The system will be simple and convenient for payers of interest and dividends. They will make their payments of withheld taxes to the Government in one lump sum quarterly. They will not be required to keep detailed records of individuals to whom they make dividend and interest payments. In addition, they will be permitted to retain use of the withheld taxes for certain specified periods before they are turned over to the Government—a provision which will help offset the cost of withholding.

Withholding may involve some inconveniences, it is true. But the alternative is clear—continued lawless evasion of \$800 million worth of taxes each year or nearly \$4 billion of unreported interest and dividend income.

Honest taxpayers will support this proposal in justice to themselves and all others who now pay their full share of taxes.

AMENDMENT OF THE AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10788) to amend section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], I ask unanimous consent that the amendment offered by him numbered "5-15-62-A" be amended by changing the period in line 11, insert a semicolon, and adding: "or until the President has exerted bona fide efforts to negotiate such agreements as to those commodities and has failed therein; or makes a finding that imports of such commodities do not seriously affect domestic producers."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment, as modified, will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

FINAL RESULTS OF THE FARM POLICY POLL

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, on March 15, the Senator from Nebraska reported to the Senate the results of a poll taken by the Farm Journal on the kind of agriculture program America's farmers really want.

At that time, 10,000 ballots had been tabulated and the results were that 4 percent of those voting favored a program of compulsory quotas, 44 percent wanted a land retirement program and 52 percent wanted the Government "clear out" of farming.

Now, the Farm Journal has finished tabulating more than 64,000 ballots and the results remain surprisingly consistent with those at the 10,000-ballot level. Four percent still favor the compulsory program, 43 percent want land retirement and 53 percent want the Government "out."

Mr. President, this information was sent to me recently by Mr. Carroll Streeter, editor of the Farm Journal. I ask unanimous consent that his letter, together with a memorandum explaining the final results of this annual poll, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and memorandum were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 1, 1962.

Hon. ROMAN L. HRUSKA,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: About 2 months ago we were able to send you advance results of the tabulation of 10,000 ballots received in Farm Journal's mail poll on farm policy. In the April issue of Farm Journal we carried the results in a feature article which went to our 3 million subscribers.

We've been counting votes ever since. We think that the response is practically all in by now and in the June issue of Farm Journal (which will be out in the country about May 21) we will report the final result. This will be compiled from no less than 64,560 ballots—truly an amazing response from the country.

Again we want to send you the report in advance, for we know that Congress is faced right now with some important decisions on farm policy questions. Enclosed you will find a memorandum which Claude Gifford, our farm policy editor, prepared for our own staff. This not only gives you the final results but some sidelights which you may find interesting.

Sincerely,

CARROLL P. STREETER,
Editor, Farm Journal.

FARM JOURNAL MEMORANDUM

(By G. W. Gifford)

The most successful farm poll that we have ever conducted is now completed. Readers sent in more than 65,000 ballots in response to the article in the March issue. We tabulated 64,560 good ballots where the reader's vote was clearly indicated (some marked 2 choices, some forgot to mark any).

The vote that we printed in the April issue (the results from the 10,000) and the final vote are:

[Percent]

| | 10,000 reported in the April issue | Final tally of 64,560 ballots |
|---------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Compulsory quotas..... | 4 | 4 |
| Land retirement..... | 44 | 43 |
| Government clear out..... | 52 | 53 |

This is a remarkably close agreement between the results at the 10,000 level and the final tally, particularly when you compare the methods that we used on the two.

Our situation was this: We wanted to report the vote in the April issue, the first issue after the ballot appeared. We estimated that we could rustle up the manpower to open, sort by State, commodity, and age; and tabulate 10,000 ballots in time to carry the followup in the April issue. We couldn't take the first 10,000 ballots that came in and get a representative nationwide vote, since the ballots came back to us in direct relationship to the States and areas that received the issue first. So we allotted each State its share of the 10,000 ballots in proportion to its share of our 3-million-plus circulation, then took the first ballots we came across to fill each State's share. However, we took only ballots where the voter indicated that he had a main crop or kind of livestock that was important to his income. This assured us that we had ballots from actual farmers.

It took some doing to tabulate those 10,000 ballots. Altogether, 27 Farm Journal people spent 750 man-hours opening, sorting, and counting those 10,000 ballots.

As you'll recall, we received 50,000 ballots the first 2 weeks. This is a tremendous response. It indicates the responsiveness of Farm Journal readers; the interest that they had in the subject; the clear choices in the ballot; the readers' gratitude for an opportunity to express their own opinions and their faith in Farm Journal. Many readers sent their replies by air mail, so eager were they to "be counted." Altogether, the readers spent well over \$2,600 on postage alone.

The amazing response to this ballot showed in other ways. Newspapers in several States reprinted the ballot—one even used a local byline on the article and reprinted the material word-for-word. Farm groups held mass votings and sent us the results in the form of signatures, as in a petition. Vocational agriculture teachers reproduced the ballots and held votes in night school. People wrote in for extra ballots. Some complained that "friends" had taken their ballots, and they either wanted another one or sent a letter telling us how they wanted to vote. (We counted only ballots that were clipped from Farm Journal.)

And a great number wrote letters. Some sent carbon copies of the letters to their Congressman; even to the President. Others asked us to forward their vote to Washington, D.C. A great many thanked Farm Journal for giving them a chance to register their opinions; others praised us for "going to farmers themselves" for their views. Some printed in large letters at the heading of their message: "Please Read." Some wrote, "You'll probably never read this, but here's how I feel." By the way, we're reading every letter, and answering those where it is appropriate, including those who say, "You'll probably never read this."

One farmer demanded that we reprint his letter, and all of it, not just part of it. He wrote at some length—several times more copy than we ran in the March article itself. We wrote and told him that we simply couldn't reprint his entire letter since it was longer than our feature articles.

A 36-year-old Indiana farmer wrote: "Here and now I want to say congratulations and thank you. Please keep encouraging every farmer to voice his opinion. There were hundreds of letters like this."

RECESS UNTIL 11 O'CLOCK TOMORROW

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I move, pursuant to the order previously entered, that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock a.m., tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 33 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Thursday, May 17, 1962, at 11 o'clock a.m.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate May 16, 1962:

U.S. ATTORNEY

Drew J. T. O'Keefe, of Pennsylvania, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of Pennsylvania for the term of 4 years, vice Joseph S. Lord III, resigned.

Calendar No. 1304

87TH CONGRESS
2^D SESSION

H. R. 10788

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

MAY 16, 1962

Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

AMENDMENT

Proposed by Mr. MILLER to the bill (H.R. 10788) to amend
section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956, viz:

- 1 Strike out the period and quotation marks in line 12
- 2 and insert in lieu thereof the following: “: *Provided*, That
- 3 such regulations shall be consistent with all other Trade
- 4 Agreements Acts and all agreements negotiated thereunder
- 5 and shall conform to all procedures set forth in said Acts.”.

H. R. 10788

AMENDMENT

Proposed by Mr. MILLER to the bill
(H.R. 10788) to amend section 204 of the
Agricultural Act of 1956.

MAY 16, 1962

Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

H. R. 10788

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

MAY 16, 1962

Ordered to be printed

AMENDMENT

Proposed by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and Mr. MORSE) to the bill (H.R. 10788) to amend section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956, viz:

1 In lieu of the language proposed to be inserted by the
2 amendment offered by Mr. MUNDT and others, insert the
3 following: "*Provided, however, That in addition to agree-*
4 *ments in regard to cotton and cotton textiles the President*
5 *shall negotiate agreements with representatives of foreign*
6 *nations limiting in like manner the export to the United*
7 *States from foreign countries to the following commodities:*
8 *Beef and beef products, pork and pork products, fresh and*
9 *frozen lamb, poultry and poultry products, dairy products,*
10 *timber and timber products, when in his judgment such*
11 *imports seriously affect domestic producers."*

87TH CONGRESS
2D Session

H. R. 10788

AMENDMENT

Proposed by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and Mr. MORSE) to the bill (H.R. 10788) to amend section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956.

May 16, 1962

Ordered to be printed

Calendar No. 1304

87TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 10788

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

MAY 16, 1962

Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

AMENDMENT

Proposed by Mr. HRUSKA (for Mr. MUNDT) to the bill (H.R. 10788) to amend section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956, viz:

1 On page 1, line 12, strike out the period and quotation
2 marks, insert a colon, and add the following: "*Provided,*
3 *however,* That no agreement in regard to cotton and cotton
4 textiles shall be enforced pursuant to the provisions of this
5 section until such time as the President has negotiated agree-
6 ments with representatives of foreign nations limiting in like
7 manner the export to the United States from foreign countries
8 of the following commodities: Beef and beef products, pork
9 and pork products, fresh and frozen lamb, poultry and
10 poultry products, timber and timber products, and dairy

1 products; or until the President has exerted bona fide efforts
2 to negotiate such agreements as to those commodities and
3 has failed therein; or makes a finding that imports of such
4 commodities do not seriously affect domestic producers.”

Calendar No. 1304

87TH CONGRESS
2d Session

H. R. 10788

AMENDMENT

Proposed by Mr. Hruska (for Mr. Mundt) to
the bill (H.R. 10788) to amend section 204
of the Agricultural Act of 1956.

MAY 16, 1962

Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed

May 17, 1962

SENATE

12. AGRICULTURAL IMPORTS. By a vote of 80 to 3, passed with amendments H. R. 10788, to amend Sec. 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 so as to authorize the President to regulate imports of textiles and textile products from nonparticipating countries of multilateral trade agreements (pp. 7982-8004). A similar bill, S. 3006 was indefinitely postponed (p. 8004). Conferees were appointed (p. 8004).
- By a vote of 62 to 23, agreed to an amendment by Sens. Humphrey and Morse, in the nature of a substitute for a proposed amendment by Sen. Mundt, to provide that in addition to agreements in regard to cotton and cotton textiles the President shall negotiate agreements with representatives of foreign nations limiting in like manner the export to the U. S. from foreign countries of beef and beef products, pork and pork products, fresh and frozen lamb, poultry and poultry products, dairy products, timber and timber products, when in his judgment such imports seriously affect domestic producers (pp. 7982-99). The Mundt amendment as amended by the Humphrey-Morse amendment was agreed to by a vote of 62 to 24 (p. 7999).
- By a vote of 23 to 63, rejected a motion by Sen. Mundt to table the Humphrey Morse substitute for the Mundt amendment. p. 7998
13. AMERICAN SAMOA. Passed as reported H. R. 10062, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to request heads of Federal departments and agencies to extend, without reimbursement, scientific and technical assistance to promote the welfare of American Samoa. Also, the bill extends the school lunch program to American Samoa. p. 8047
14. FARM BILL. S. 3225, the farm bill, was made the unfinished business. p. 8049
15. FARM PROGRAM. The "Daily Digest" states that the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Government Operations Committee "met in executive session and voted unanimously to hold hearings in connection with the Billie Sol Estes case, date of which hearings is as yet undetermined." p. D379
- Sen. Williams, Del., defended his recent statement of "the highly improper manner in which an employee of the Department of Agriculture was carted off, or railroaded to a mental institution," and inserted several items on this matter. pp. 8065-71
16. FEED GRAINS. Sen. Proxmire discussed why he believed "it would be a tragic mistake to enact a mandatory feed grains program as proposed by the Department of Agriculture," urged extension for 1 year of the present feed grains program, and inserted his letter to the Secretary on the matter. pp. 8071-7
17. HOSPITAL INSURANCE. Sen. McNamara stated that the L. B. -Anderson bill and related legislation calling for a Federal program of hospital insurance for America's older people "will mean even more to farmers -- young as well as old -- than it will to city people," and inserted an article on its importance to rural people. pp. 8061-3
18. PUBLIC WORKS. Sen. Gruening discussed his proposed amendment to S. 2965, the standby public works acceleration bill, to increase the amounts authorized to be appropriated to "the same amounts authorized to be appropriated for foreign economic assistance," and inserted several items to support his proposal. pp. 8053-61

3. **MARKETING PENALTIES.** Passed as reported H. R. 10594, to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, so as to provide that no penalty shall be collected with respect to the marketing of any agricultural commodity grown for experimental purposes by any publicly owned agricultural experiment station or by any privately owned nonprofit agricultural research and experiment station or foundation. pp. 7937-8, 7939-40
4. **FARM PROGRAM.** Rep. Shriver called for a "thorough investigation of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service of the U. S. Department of Agriculture." p. 7934
5. **TAXATION; FARM.** Rep. Findley demanded proof of the "charge" made by the Internal Revenue Service that "American farmers fail to report an estimated \$4 billion a year in taxable income," saying, "When the heavy hand of government also gives farmers a slap alleging colossal tax evasion, that calls for proof or apology." p. 7934
6. **TRANSPORTATION.** The Post Office and Civil Service Committee issued a report on improving Transportation Statistics (H. Rept. 1700). p. 7960
7. **PERSONNEL.** Received from GAO a report on a review of certain aspects of operations of the Federal employees' group life insurance program which is administered by the Civil Service Commission. p. 7960
Received from Interior a proposed bill "to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to employ aliens in a scientific or technical capacity"; to Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. p. 7960
The Education and Labor Committee reported without amendment H. R. 11677, to prohibit discrimination on account of sex in the payment of wages by certain employers engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce and to provide for the restitution of wages lost by employees by reason of any such discrimination (H. Rept. 1714). p. 7960
The Post Office and Civil Service Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) H. R. 11753, to provide for the payment of certain amounts and restoration on employment benefits to certain Government officers and employees improperly deprived thereof (p. D-382). The Post Office and Civil Service Committee appointed several ad hoc subcommittees to consider a number of bills p. D382
Rep. Lane said, "I join with many of my colleagues in supporting a real pay increase for Federal employees retroactive to January 1, 1962." p. 7934
8. **EDUCATION.** Rep. Harvey, Ind., discussed the land-grant college system, saying, "this month marks a century of progress insofar as land-grant colleges in the United States are concerned." pp. 7954-5
9. **COMMON MARKET.** Rep. Reuss discussed the expansion of the European Economic Community, saying, "in our preoccupation with expanding the Common Market, we have been pinning our hopes on the wrong group, pursuing the wrong goal, at the wrong time. It is entirely in order for the Congress to debate whether the United States should not start now to build the free world community." pp. 7956-9
10. **LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM.** Rep. Moss announced that H. R. 7596, the Navajo Indian irrigation project, will be considered on Tues., May 22. p. 7935
11. **ADJOURNED** until Mon., May 21. p. 7960

amptions and which will extend coverage to many millions of workers who today are being put upon by selfish interests and who are being required to work for less than a wage of health and decency.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD the article from the Oregon Labor Press of July 24, 1959, to which I have referred regarding Sister Theresa.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"SISTER MIRIAM THERESA: SHE WORKED IN SWEATSHOPS TO WIN OREGON WAGE LAW

"(By Emsie Howard)

"Forty-six years ago—in 1913—Oregon became the first State to enact an enforceable wage-hour law to protect women and minors who work for a living. Oregonians are proud of this distinction. But few of them know the erect and graceful woman who, more than any other individual, was responsible for it.

"Her name then was Miss Caroline J. Gleason. Her name today is Sister Miriam Theresa. She is head of the department of social sciences at Marylhurst College, on the west bank of the Willamette River near Portland.

"Sister Miriam Theresa's eyes are full of wisdom and kindness. And these eyes twinkle with merriment when she recalls some of the methods she used almost half a century ago to achieve her goals of social justice for women workers.

"Looking back to 1912 she says, 'I never, never dreamed that I would live to see a Federal minimum-wage law.'

"It was in 1912 that Miss Gleason directed a survey of the wages and working conditions of women working in Oregon stores, factories, canneries, and industrial plants.

"To assure the accuracy of the survey, she herself went to work in some of the worst factories. This took courage. The work was hard and dirty—and many employers considered her an enemy and a spy.

"Miss Gleason was appointed to make the survey by the Oregon Consumers' League, a group of citizens struggling to bring some kind of social justice to women who were being cruelly exploited in factories and stores. She herself was a member of the league's board of directors. When the challenge came to make the pioneering survey, she did not refuse.

"The completed survey was so devastating, so accurate, so appalling that the 1913 session of the legislature passed Oregon's first wage-hour law.

"The law established the industrial welfare commission and made it unlawful to pay women wages lower than those needed to maintain decent standards of health. It gave the commission authority to set those standards and to set a maximum workweek for women.

"The first weekly minimum was set by the commission at \$8.25 for a 54-hour week—slightly less than 16 cents an hour.

"Sister Miriam Theresa recalls that organized labor opposed the law, fearing that it would hamper the growth of unions.

"The wage-hour bill was introduced on the opening day of the 1913 legislative session. Employers descended on the legislature to lobby vigorously against this outrageous, socialistic measure.

"It will drive industry from the State. * * * It will reduce the wages of men. * * * It will throw women out of work because, if they are forced to pay higher wages, employers won't hire so many women.' These were some of their arguments.

"Hot on their heels to lobby just as vigorously, but more effectively, came Caroline Gleason.

"Employers were claiming that the conditions revealed in her survey simply do not exist.

"Miss Gleason quietly replied: 'If you would like the names and addresses of the firms where these conditions prevail, I shall be glad to give them to you.'

"Silence. No one asked for the names.

"Miss Gleason had the facts. She got them the hard way. She had worked in the plants.

"Her first job during the survey was in a paper box factory in Portland. Sister Miriam Theresa remembers:

"Our job was to paste labels on the ends of shoeboxes. We sat at a long table with a huge gluepot in the center. A gas jet burned under the pot to heat the glue. The resulting odors were something less than pleasant.

"After two or three labels our hands were covered with glue and had to be washed. But there was no hot water. We carried 5-gallon pails to another part of the plant where live steam was pouring from a pipe. We held our pails under the pipe until the steam had heated the water.

"You must remember that this was piecework and all these preparations took time. In 3 days I earned \$1.52.'

"During her lunch hour Miss Gleason wandered casually through the plant to observe the appallingly unsanitary conditions and fire hazards.

"This was the way the survey was made. This was how Oregon's pioneering wage-hour law was born.

"Caroline Gleason was well equipped to direct the survey. A graduate of the University of Minnesota, she came to Oregon in 1908 to teach Latin and English. But her compelling interest in social conditions took her to the University of Chicago in 1910 for graduate work in social studies. This interest had been stimulated earlier by social work in Philadelphia, Baltimore, New York, and other large industrial centers.

"She speaks with sincere modesty of the survey. 'Compared to the scientific methods employed in similar studies today, our survey seems a very small effort,' she says. 'But we had the facts.'

"The validity of her work was proved when an employer challenged the new law in the courts. (The employer was the owner of the paper box factory where Miss Gleason took her first industrial job.)

"A brilliant young lawyer named Louis Brandeis came out from the East to volunteer his services in defense of the law. Brandeis used Caroline Gleason's survey as a basis of his defense before the State supreme court. He won. The court upheld the law.

"Both Louis Brandeis and the Oregon wage-hour law went on up to the U.S. Supreme Court. The Court upheld the law's constitutionality. And Brandeis later became one of the great liberal Justices of the highest Court in the land.

"Another notable contribution made by Miss Gleason was a housing survey in Portland. Again the Oregon Consumers League called upon her to direct the survey. She trudged on foot many miles a day to inspect the living conditions of working people. The frightful conditions disclosed in her survey resulted in a new city ordinance based on the model tenement housing law of the Housing Association of New York.

"Before this survey was completed, Miss Gleason became a Roman Catholic nun. 'I knew from the time I was a girl that some day I would enter the church,' she said. Her conviction that education of youth was one of the best means of achieving improved social conditions was decisive. In 1916 she entered the Sisters of the Holy Names of Jesus and Mary, a teaching community.

"Sister Miriam Theresa's interests are by no means limited to the classroom. Of unions she has this to say: 'I certainly believe in the trade union philosophy. Without unions, the conditions of working people would be almost indescribable.'

"The complete background of Oregon's first minimum-wage law will be available to students when Sister Miriam Theresa finishes the article she is now writing for the Oregon Historical Society.

"It will be one of the proudest chapters in the history of our State."

PEACE OFFICERS' MEMORIAL DAY

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, this year, for the first time, we celebrate Police Week and in my own State of Rhode Island, this day has been proclaimed by Governor Nottee as Peace Officers' Memorial Day. It is, indeed, fitting that we pay tribute to the many brave peace officers throughout our Nation who have been killed or disabled in the line of duty. All too often we tend to take for granted the protection which our peace officers afford us. Their working conditions leave much to be desired and in all too many instances, they are badly underpaid.

As a grateful citizen, I am pleased to have this opportunity to call attention to those who have lost their lives or suffered disability in the performance of their most important duty.

THE LATE GERALD M. KERR

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, it is with regret that I inform the Senate of the passing of a distinguished civil servant, a native of Richmond, Utah, a man widely known in the West, who faithfully served in key positions in the Federal service over the long period of 44 years.

I refer to the late Gerald M. Kerr who, until his death on Monday, was Assistant Director for Range and Forest Management of the Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior, responsible for a program affecting 30,000 livestock ranches in the West.

Mr. Kerr, a graduate of Utah Agricultural College, now Utah State University, joined the Geological Survey in 1917. In 1934 he joined the original staff of the Grazing Service and was instrumental in the initial establishment and operation of the grazing districts under the Taylor Grazing Act.

After a period as regional supervisor of the Service at Salt Lake City, Utah, Mr. Kerr joined the headquarters staff of the Grazing Service, now the Bureau of Land Management in Washington, D.C. Over the years he served in positions of increasing scope and responsibility, leading to his appointment in 1961 as Assistant Director for Range and Forest Management in charge of conservation and land use activities on 170 millions of acres of public lands in the West.

In 1954, Mr. Kerr was granted the highest award of the Department of the Interior, its distinguished honor award, in recognition of his outstanding con-

tribution to the management and uses of public lands.

Mr. Kerr has appeared many times as a Department witness before committees of this body.

Members of the Senate who knew Gerry Kerr will join with me in noting the passing of this good and faithful public servant, who by his work has added stature to our country's civil service, and integrity to his chosen profession in his life's work of conservation of our public lands and resources.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

AMENDMENT OF THE AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10788) to amend section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, what is the unfinished business?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The unfinished business is House bill 10788, Calendar 1304, to amend section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956.

Debate on that bill is subject to the unanimous-consent agreements entered into on yesterday.

The pending question is on agreeing to the Humphrey-Morse amendment in the nature of a substitute for the Mundt amendment, as modified.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Chair. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION AND THE ADMINISTRATION'S HEALTH CARE PROGRAM

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, yesterday a committee of physicians reported that an advertisement supporting the administration's health care program had been rejected by the Journal of the American Medical Association.

Dr. Caldwell B. Esselstyn, a member of the Physicians Committee for Health Care for the Aged Through Social Security, criticized the Journal of the American Medical Association with these words:

This stand is consistent with the policy of protecting the American Medical Association membership from any exposure to an unemotional presentation of facts proving the necessity and the need for financing certain basic costs of the aged through social security.

Strange as it may seem, I happen to be involved in this issue, in an indirect way.

Last year, I wrote to the editors of the Journal of the American Medical Association to offer a factual article under my own byline on the program of health insurance for the elderly which would be

established by the Anderson-King bill.

I have long been interested in this proposed legislation, since I was one of the early sponsors of a bill in Congress, starting in 1949, and have been every 2 years since that time, to bring persons aged 65 and older under the terms of social security for the provision of hospital and nursing home care. This has been a long-term effort of mine. Therefore, I was pleased when the Journal of the American Medical Association accepted my article. It was published in the September 9 edition of the magazine.

Today I wish to repeat my appreciation to the Journal of the American Medical Association for publishing that article. It was printed without any editing or critical comment. I was pleased that the tens of thousands of American doctors who read the Journal were given this detailed statement on the Anderson-King program.

The American Medical Association, responding to Dr. Esselstyn's complaint about the rejected advertisement, said:

The ad was refused because it was misleading and deceptive.

The statement also denied that the Journal refused to present both sides of the issue of the Anderson-King bill, basing that denial on the fact that my article was published on September 9.

Mr. President, I would hope that my article in the Journal of the American Medical Association will not be used as a continuing excuse by the editors to close the pages of the Journal to the many physicians who support social security financing of health insurance for the elderly.

My own article, I believe, was effective. I tried to make it as effectual and objective a presentation as possible. After its publication, I received letters from many doctors throughout the Nation who reported they had not known many of the facts of the health care issue until they had read the article. Many wrote to me that they had never really known what the provisions of the Anderson-King bill are.

But that one article which I was privileged to write, and which the American Medical Association Journal published, does not justify a continuing blackout of the viewpoint which favors the Anderson-King program. This legislation is a continuing issue, under continuous discussion throughout the Nation. It deserves continuing, responsible discussion in the Journal of the American Medical Association and all other news media—I should think above all in the American Medical Association Journal.

Mr. President, a full and accurate understanding of the facts of President Kennedy's medical program, known as the Anderson-King bill, by America's physicians is important. The Journal of the American Medical Association is probably read by America's physicians more than any other publication. I may add that it is an excellent professional journal.

The Journal has its own distinct viewpoint, one of opposition to the Anderson-King bill. It is the Journal's right to

express that viewpoint as effectively as it is able.

But I suggest that the Journal has a responsibility to its readers, the physicians of America—who, by the way, pay for the Journal—to give the opposite viewpoint more than just one chance of expression on its pages.

I considered the publication of my article on health care in the Journal evidence of the fairness of that magazine. I hope that the Journal's editors will reconsider the rejection of the advertisement submitted by Dr. Esselstyn's committee of doctors, who are fully accredited according to the professional standards of the American Medical Association, and thus add continuing evidence to its claim for continuing fairness.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record an article entitled "AMA Rejects Ad for Kennedy Bill," published in the New York Times for today, Thursday, May 17, 1962, and a reprint of my article which was published in the Journal of the American Medical Association for September 9, 1961.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York Times, May 17, 1962]
AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION REJECTS AD FOR KENNEDY BILL—PHYSICIANS' GROUP PROTESTS—PRESIDENT DETERMINED
(By Marjorie Hunter)

WASHINGTON, May 16.—A group of physicians charged today that the Journal of the American Medical Association had refused to run their advertisement supporting the Kennedy medical-care-for-the-aged program.

The charge was made by the Physicians Committee for Health Care for the Aged Through Social Security, which is actively supporting the administration bill. The American Medical Association opposes the proposed legislation.

Meanwhile, there was new evidence today that President Kennedy planned to press hard for passage of the King-Anderson bill this year.

"I want to tell you the President has the bit in his mouth about medicare," Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat of Minnesota, said after a White House meeting today.

Mr. HUMPHREY said that Mr. Kennedy was "kindly and soft hearted" on the steel price case "compared with his determination to get action on the medical care program."

If the House committee fails to act, the Senator said, a Senate bill on medical care will be added to some House-passed measure to force a joint Senate-House conference.

ADVERTISEMENT REJECTED

Discussing the advertising ban, Dr. Caldwell B. Esselstyn of Hudson, N.Y., spokesman for the committee, said the American Medical Association had refused to carry the advertisement in The Journal for June 2.

He produced a letter asserting that the Department of Advertising Evaluation of the American Medical Association had concluded that the advertisement "does not conform to our standards."

The advertisement showed a picture of Mr. Kennedy meeting with the 40 original members of the physicians' committee outside the White House this spring. It also asked for contributions to push the fight for the bill which would finance care for the aged through the social security system.

The American Medical Association in a brief statement, acknowledged that "the ad

was refused because it was misleading and deceptive."

The organization denied that it had refused to present both sides of the issue. It said its journal last September 9 published a two-page statement by Senator HUMPHREY, in support of the medical care bill.

In his protest Dr. Esselstyn said:

"This stand is consistent with the policy of protecting the American Medical Association membership from any exposure to an unemotional presentation of facts proving the necessity and the need for financing certain basic costs of the aged through social security."

Dr. Esselstyn said that the action was also consistent with the American Medical Association's stand against allowing any "voice of dissent" in the news columns of its journal.

"We know the walls of Jericho didn't go down the first time and we'll continue to try to put the facts before the American Medical Association membership," Dr. Esselstyn said.

He said that the physicians' committee was now supported by nearly 1,000 doctors, most of them members of the American Medical Association.

[From the American Medical Association Journal, Sept. 9, 1961]

HEALTH CARE UNDER SOCIAL SECURITY

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Senator HUMPHREY asked for an opportunity to present in the Journal his views on health care under social security. The American Medical Association disagrees with Senator HUMPHREY in principle, and specifically with many of the statements which appear in this communication. In deference to him, however, his manuscript is reproduced without critical comment or annotation.)

(A summary of the testimony on the King bill, H.R. 4222, by Dr. L. W. Larson was published in the August 12, 1961, issue of the Journal.)

(By Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY)

The White House Conference on the Aging was an eye opener for many of the delegates who came to Washington early this year. They learned for the first time that reasonable, responsible citizens—who are completely opposed to socialized medicine—can support social security financing of health care for elderly Americans. I want to emphasize the word "financing." As President Kennedy declared: "This is not a program of socialized medicine. It is a program of prepayment of health costs with absolute freedom of choice guaranteed. Every person will choose his own doctor and hospital."

Too often, members of the medical profession foresee bureaucratic controls and Federal redtape interfering in their freedom, lowering the high quality of medical care, and imposing dismal mediocrity on America's doctors. As I pointed out in my television debate with Dr. Edward Annis, I have a high regard for the American Medical Association and for the contributions of American medicine to the health and welfare of the American people. I know that American doctors contribute a great deal of work for which they get no compensation. Therefore, I have been deeply concerned about the widespread misunderstanding that I have encountered among my friends in the medical profession on the subject of social security financing of health care for aged people.

I give full credit to the wonders of modern medical science and to the medical profession for the startling increases in the proportion of our population over 65 years of age. We now have about 17 million Americans over 65, and by 1970 this number may reach 20 million. These elderly people spend twice as many days a year in hospitals and

have 2 to 3 times as great an incidence of illness as the rest of the population. Less than half have any kind of health insurance.

What about the Kerr-Mills program? Doesn't it meet the need of low-income elderly people for health insurance? This program increases Federal payments to the States to expand existing public assistance medical care programs, and it sets up a new program, authorizing Federal payments on a matching (formula) basis to the States, to help people over 65 who cannot afford adequate medical care, even though they are not on the public relief rolls. There is no limit on the Federal liability under the Kerr-Mills program. If all the States took advantage of this law, the cost to the Federal Government would go sky high—and it would all come out of general taxes, out of the Federal budget. This is the worst kind of fiscal irresponsibility. Furthermore, the Kerr-Mills program fails to include the vitally important principle of freedom of choice, a principle I supported last year during the debate on this program. The Senate adopted my freedom of choice proposal this year, but, unfortunately, the joint Senate-House conference committee dropped this amendment to the Kerr-Mills program. I might add that the freedom of choice protection for doctor and patient is specifically included in our social security health care program. The Federal Government puts up 56 to 80 percent of the money under the Kerr-Mills Federal-State program. Even with this inducement, the program has stalled because most States simply cannot afford this added cost. They cannot or will not put up the necessary matching money.

This does not mean that I regard the Kerr-Mills program as completely useless. On the contrary, I believe it can supplement the social security health care program. If health care for the vast majority of elderly people is financed through social security, the Kerr-Mills program can be used to pay for medical services to needy people who are not eligible for social security retirement benefits.

Can private insurance solve the health cost problems of our elderly citizens? Unfortunately the answer is "no." Premium costs are high because aged people are poor health risks. Policies are often canceled, cancellable, or not available for people over 65. And for those who do have some kind of health insurance, protection is too often inadequate or hedged about with restrictive limitations. A typical health policy for a person over 65 costs \$6.50 a month, but offers only \$10 a day for 31 days in the hospital, a \$200 maximum for surgery, and a \$100 maximum for other expenses. This premium is too high for the average oldster whose monthly social security check is less than \$75, and the benefits are certainly not adequate when serious, disabling, long-term illness strikes.

Let me outline the social security health care program which I am sponsoring with Senator CLINTON ANDERSON on behalf of the Kennedy administration. This program will provide hospitalization, nursing home, and home nursing services to the 14 million men and women aged 65 and over who are receiving social security retirement benefits. The plan includes hospital outpatient diagnostic services, but it does not pay for physicians' services in the home or office, and it does not include fees for surgery. A hospital patient could get up to 90 days of hospital care for each illness, but he would have to pay \$10 a day for the first 9 days, with a minimum payment of \$20. Skilled nursing home services—up to 180 days—would be available after a patient is discharged from a hospital, and up to 240 days of visiting nursing services in the home. There is a maximum of 150 units of benefits with 1 unit equal to 1 day of hospital care, 2 days of nursing home

care, and 2½ days of home care. This legislation establishes the policy that less expensive nursing home and home care services shall be utilized whenever possible in lieu of hospitalization.

To reassure those who fear Federal controls, I want to quote from the opening statement of our proposal, where we state that these health benefits will be provided to elderly people "in a manner consistent with the dignity and self-respect of each individual without interfering in any way with the free choice of physicians or other health personnel or facilities by the individual, without the exercise of any Federal supervision or control over the practice of medicine by any doctor or over the manner in which medical services are provided by any hospital."

If the burden of hospital expenses is eased for our elderly citizens, I am convinced that they will be in a better position to pay the remaining expenses of doctors' fees for consultation, diagnosis, treatment, or surgery. Thus, social security financing for hospitalization and related services will improve the prospects for payments to physicians and will virtually eliminate the need for unpaid charity care of elderly people by America's doctors.

How will we pay for these health benefits? The same way we pay for social security retirement benefits. We will use the time-tested, proven principles of social insurance to spread the costs of retirement benefits over the citizens' working, earning years. Congress has been scrupulously careful to keep payments for social security benefits in line with income of the social security trust fund over the past 25 years. Here is what Mr. Marion S. Folsom, former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare under President Eisenhower, said last August about the social security system:

"The record of Congress in the past 25 years in maintaining the system on a sound basis has been good. The latest estimates indicate that the present system is, for all practical purposes, on a sound actuarial basis. That is to say, the cost of benefits now provided as projected ahead over a long period of years is about in balance with contributions as presently scheduled and likewise projected."

Thus, we have already the records, the statistics, the administrative know-how, and the trained personnel to set up the health insurance program under social security without great expansion of administrative costs. These costs come to less than 2 percent of the present social security program. Private insurance carriers are fortunate if administrative costs are as low as 5 percent, and they often reach 10 or 20 percent of benefit payments.

We propose to raise the base income in which social security taxes are paid from \$4,800 to \$5,000. Furthermore, we propose to increase the tax rate paid by employers and employees by one-quarter of 1 percent, raising the total payroll contribution by one-half of 1 percent. Self-employed people covered by social security would pay only three-eighths of 1 percent. These two changes will bring \$1,500 million a year into the trust fund. With these two small changes, the social security trust fund will be actuarially sound. There is no danger that outgo will exceed income. We have carefully limited and delayed benefits to make sure that this program will be properly financed with an adequate reserve on sound insurance principles.

This program will lift an enormous burden from private commercial and nonprofit insurance plans and enable them to provide health insurance for younger people with lower health risks at lower cost. Furthermore, local welfare agencies, hospitals, and

private charities—not to mention doctors—now providing so much free service for elderly people will also be relieved of serious financial sacrifices. If the major costs of hospitalization and nursing home care are met by social insurance, these elderly people will be in a better position to meet necessary costs of physicians' services. Similarly, the Federal Government, which now spends more than a third of a million dollars a year on health care for the aged under public assistance and veterans' programs, would save substantial sums from its general tax revenues.

I hope that I have made it clear that a program of health benefits for the elderly is not socialized medicine. Our proposal for social security financing of these benefits is designed to minimize the need for unpaid charity by putting the major costs of health care for the elderly within a soundly financed, proven social insurance program. By so doing, we will enhance the dignity and freedom of America's medical profession.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. Has the Senator from Minnesota seen the advertisement referred to?

Mr. HUMPHREY. No; but it is discussed in the article.

Mr. CURTIS. But the Senator from Minnesota has not seen the advertisement, then?

Mr. HUMPHREY. No, I have not.

Mr. CURTIS. Does the Senator from Minnesota believe that any publication should be compelled to publish an advertisement which, in the opinion of the editors of that publication, is misleading?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Let me say that my plea to the Journal is that the doctors who are members of its own association and who pay for the Journal should be given an opportunity to have their point of view presented. The doctors who have prepared this advertisement are accredited, respectable, honorable, outstanding members of the medical profession; and I cannot believe that they would be any more deceptive in their practice of medicine; and in their practice of medicine they are very honorable.

Mr. CURTIS. I am not suggesting that they were wilfully deceptive. My question is, Should this publication be compelled to publish an advertisement if the editors of the publication are of the opinion that the advertisement is misleading?

Mr. HUMPHREY. No, they should not; if the advertisement is misleading, of course it should not be published in any publication. As a matter of fact, if it is a misleading, the Federal Trade Commission should examine it, just as it does all other advertisements that are believed to be misleading. But the question of whether an advertisement is misleading can be determined only by application of the professional and scientific standards on the part of those who prepared the advertisement and on the part of those who then are asked to accept the advertisement, and, finally, by an instrumentality of the Government of the United States.

Mr. CURTIS. Is the Senator from Minnesota suggesting censorship of advertisements?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Certainly I am not. However, I am suggesting that honor and truth in advertising have been established by the Congress, by public law; and every day of the week the Federal Trade Commission examines to determine whether the public is being deceived by improper advertising.

I do not believe in public censorship, or private censorship, either.

Mr. CURTIS. But should not the publication determine, before the advertisement is published, whether it is misleading?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The publication has a right to determine whether the advertisement is misleading; yes.

Mr. CURTIS. And it also has a right to turn it down, does it not?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes, to turn it down.

The Journal of the American Medical Association is a very fine publication; and the doctors who are members of the association, and who prepared the advertisement, are very outstanding men; and my point is that I believe that, in fairness, the Journal should publish the advertisement.

I am not suggesting that there be forced or required publication or censorship, either public or private; but I do not want word to get out that the Journal of the American Medical Association is unfair—because I do not think it is. I want that made quite clear; and I also want it made quite clear that when the American Medical Association Journal accepted my article, it made no complaint, it made no criticism, and it did no editing. But I feel that the views of members of the American Medical Association might carry more weight on such matters than the views of a Member of the Senate; and my plea to the American Medical Association Journal is to reconsider; my plea is that it will do no harm, and may help establish for the Journal a continuing reputation for complete fairness; and I am of the opinion that it will do a great deal to prove to the public that the American Medical Association and its Journal are taking an objective view of this issue.

I may state here that the editors of the Journal are certainly entitled to express their own view as vigorously and as effectively as they can—and their view is one of opposition. But I hope they will permit freedom of expression on the pages of their Journal.

AMENDMENT OF THE AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10788) to amend section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Fong].

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Hawaii is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I rise in support of the amendment sponsored by

the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] and the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA].

Mr. President, if the Congress of the United States is to embark upon a program of special protection for one agricultural industry, cotton, it behooves the Congress to consider other farm industries similarly hurt by unfair competition from abroad.

The Mundt amendment would require the executive branch to invoke the same protectionism in regard to American beef and beef products, pork and pork products, poultry and poultry products, dairy products, fresh and frozen lamb, timber, and timber products, as the President invokes with regard to American cotton.

In the case of cotton, the pending bill empowers the President to negotiate trade agreements with cotton exporting countries who are not now parties to the 19-nation cotton-textile agreement.

It is a protectionist remedy, one which gives the President carte blanche power to deal with imports from certain countries which our cotton interests fear could flood the U.S. market and further depress our cotton industry.

The Mundt amendment provides that no cotton agreements shall go into effect until the President has negotiated agreements with foreign nations limiting in like manner their exports to the United States of beef and beef products, pork and pork products, fresh and frozen lamb, poultry and poultry products, dairy products, timber and timber products.

I understand the amendment has just been modified to include a provision stating in effect that if the President does negotiate in a bona fide manner, but still is unable to reach an agreement, the textile agreement can go into effect.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator from Hawaii yield?

Mr. FONG. I yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. Or if the President makes a finding that imports of such commodities do not seriously affect producers, then the cotton agreement may go into effect.

Mr. FONG. I thank the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. President, this amendment does not prohibit imports of the enumerated farm commodities. It only gives to the President the power to reach an agreement with foreign exporting nations on these additional products which will prevent the destruction of our American farmers.

Members of Congress are keenly aware of the plight of cotton growers and textile producers in our Nation. It has been one contributing cause of our persisting high unemployment.

Certainly, I am in agreement with the general proposition that our first duty as a nation is to our domestic industries and to our American workers.

H.R. 10788 is in accord with that principle, but it is limited only to cotton, whereas other agriculture industries in

different parts of the country are today facing a similar predicament.

Let us extend the same protectionist features provided for cotton to these other hard-hit farm industries.

In Hawaii, the people of our State face special problems in regard to foodstuffs as well as to all consumer products, for we import two-thirds of the food we eat and more than 90 percent of all other consumer goods.

We are heavily dependent on imports from the mainland and from abroad.

We are seeking to reduce our dependence upon outside products in regard to basic foodstuffs, so that our people will not suffer whenever our sources of supply are denied us through shipping tieups or through some other emergency.

We are increasing our truck-farm products. We are trying to build our beef cattle industry, to build up our poultry and poultry products industries, to build our pork and our lamb industries, to build up our dairy industry.

Beset by high costs because feedstuffs must be imported, these industries face further difficulties stemming from low-cost foreign competition.

There is some question whether some of Hawaii's domestic farm industries can continue to survive in the face of such competition.

In the case of beef, for example, the national figures show in 1958, total imports of beef and beef products constituted 8.6 percent of total beef and veal production. In 1959, these total imports again were 8.6 percent. In 1960, they declined somewhat to 5.9 percent; and in 1961, they were 7.9 percent.

In Hawaii, the sale of foreign beef within the past 5 years has increased from slightly less than 5 percent of all the beef sold in Hawaii to approximately 25 percent. In other words, the importation of foreign beef into the State of Hawaii is more than 300 percent greater than the national average of 7.9 percent.

So alarming is Hawaii's domestic beef situation that the Legislature of the State of Hawaii in April of this year adopted a concurrent resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to instigate a Federal study on imports of foreign beef and to consider imposing a quota on beef imports. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the Hawaii State Legislature's resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 3

Concurrent resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to ask for a further study of the problem of foreign beef importation

Whereas the increased importation of foreign frozen beef has been causing undue hardships to cattlemen in Hawaii who must compete with foreign beef not measured or regulated according to U.S. standards; and

Whereas Honolulu, Hawaii, the closest and highest priced American port, is the favorite market for "down-under" beef; and

Whereas in 1960, 24 percent of Hawaii's market supply came from "down-under," compared to only 1.7 percent for the entire United States; and

Whereas a certain limited amount of foreign beef in the Hawaiian market is welcomed, but sale of such beef within the past 5 years has increased from slightly less than 5 percent to approximately 25 percent, and if this trend is allowed to continue, the cattle industry in Hawaii will soon be thoroughly ruined; and

Whereas Hawaii's cattle industry is an important part of the island economy, it is of vital necessity that it be preserved, not only to help stabilize the general economy, but to insure local self-sufficiency of beef as well: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate of the first State legislature, budget session of 1962 (the house of representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby respectfully requested to ask an appropriate department of the Federal Government to give further study to the importation of foreign beef to the United States ports and to consider the advisability of imposing a quota on the importation of beef, equal in total to the present importation level, with periodic adjustments therein to be determined; and be it further

Resolved, That certified copies of this concurrent resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, to the Honorable HIRAM L. FONG and the Honorable OREN E. LONG, Senators to Congress from Hawaii, and to Congressman DANIEL K. INOUE, Representative to Congress from Hawaii.

W. H. HILL,
President of the Senate.

JAMES H. KAMO,
Clerk of the Senate.

ELMER F. CRAVALHO,
Speaker, House of Representatives.

Clerk, House of Representatives.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, the heart of the resolution reads as follows:

Whereas the increased importation of foreign frozen beef has been causing undue hardships to cattlemen in Hawaii who must compete with foreign beef not measured or regulated according to U.S. standards; and

Whereas Honolulu, Hawaii, the closest and highest priced American port, is the favorite market for "down-under" beef; and

Whereas in 1960, 24 percent of Hawaii's market supply came from "down-under," compared to only 1.7 percent for the entire United States; and—

Mr. President, "down-under" refers to New Zealand and Australia—

Whereas a certain limited amount of foreign beef in the Hawaiian market is welcomed, but sale of such beef within the past 5 years has increased from slightly less than 5 percent to approximately 25 percent, and if this trend is allowed to continue, the cattle industry in Hawaii will soon be thoroughly ruined; and

Whereas Hawaii's cattle industry is an important part of the island economy, it is of vital necessity that it be preserved, not only to help stabilize the general economy, but to insure local self-sufficiency of beef as well: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the senate of the first State legislature, budget session of 1962 (the house of representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby respectfully requested to ask an appropriate department of the Federal Government to give further study to the importation of foreign beef to the U.S. ports and to consider the advisability of imposing a quota on the importation of beef, equal in total to the present importation level, with periodic adjustments therein to be determined. * * **

It is a little known fact outside of Hawaii that our beef cattle industry is a long-established one, which for more than a century has comprised an important source of meat for our dinner tables and has furnished employment and income for many Hawaii citizens.

Next to our two main farm commodities, sugar and pineapple, whose value exceeds more than \$100 million a year each, beef cattle ranks as a leading agricultural industry, alternating with our dairy industry in third or fourth place. Last year beef cattle had a total retail value of \$15 million. In that year 30 million pounds of beef were produced in Hawaii.

One of our fine ranches, the Parker Ranch on the Island of Hawaii, is the second largest cattle ranch in the world, covering 262,000 acres. It has the largest herd of whitefaced Herefords in the world, numbering more than 36,000 head.

Hawaii has 410 ranches, with more than a million acres in all devoted to beef production. More than 168,000 head of cattle are supported on our island ranches.

Slightly more than half of all beef consumed in Hawaii is home-produced. About 25 percent is imported from foreign sources. The remainder is obtained from our sister States.

Mr. President, we in Hawaii are doing our best to cope with a difficult food supply situation. We are trying to devise means to protect the needs of consumers, workers, producers, and processors in Hawaii and to obtain a better balance between local supplies and local demand.

Consumers need protection not only regarding the price of beef, lamb, pork, poultry, and dairy products, but also regarding a dependable supply of these foods. Our workers need protection so that they may have jobs on farms, ranches, in processing plants, and all the related fields of employment. Our industries need protection so that they may provide jobs.

But, the sovereign State of Hawaii cannot, without Federal legislation and technical assistance of Federal agencies, cope with the serious problem of increasing imports of farm products from abroad.

All that we supporters of the Mundt amendment are asking is that the protection extended to cotton be extended similarly to livestock, poultry, and timber, which are important industries in various parts of our Nation.

Certainly, livestock, poultry, and timber are basic industries in the U.S. economy, employing thousands of people and feeding and sheltering millions of Americans.

In the case of Hawaii, our only Island State, we have a particular and urgent need to expand and strengthen our agricultural production and employment, which are fundamental to a stable and healthy economy.

The Mundt amendment will materially aid our statewide efforts to develop and diversify our farm economy. I therefore ask the adoption of the Mundt amendment.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will my colleague yield some time to me?

Mr. HRUSKA. How much time does the Senator wish?

Mr. CURTIS. Five minutes.

Mr. HRUSKA. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Hawaii for a clear and forceful statement. His is a viewpoint which is taken in the interest of our country and all the States thereof.

I also congratulate and commend my distinguished colleague [Mr. HRUSKA] and the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] for proposing their amendment and for the leadership they have given to it.

Mr. President, the production of food is something that, in the main, should be encouraged near the point of consumption. Our country can relieve starvation in far places by shipping food there, but it is cumbersome, costly, and often-time involves deterioration of food. Every country of the world should be encouraged to be self-sufficient in the production of food.

Imports of beef and beef products, pork and pork products, fresh and frozen lamb, poultry and poultry products, and dairy products have not only been too great—they have been on the increase. This is true when there is a general policy of curtailment on the part of American agriculture imposed by the Government. While this curtailment in acreage has been related to grains, cotton, and like crops, nevertheless the program of land retirement, at a cost of millions of dollars, has been aimed at the reduction of the supply of agricultural products in this country.

How can we justify the Government of the United States paying millions of dollars to prevent the production of food in this country and then not turning a hand to prevent the production of food outside the United States and its importation to and sale in this country?

Many of the problems of price in the entire field of agriculture could be solved, or partially solved, by a curtailing of imports. Many of the problems of the U.S. Government in discouraging production, with the great expense connected therewith, could be solved, or partially solved, by curtailing the importation of food into the United States. Why should Uncle Sam, with all his wealth, be a purchaser of food from abroad when so much of the rest of the world is hungry? We should not be importing that food into this country; we should be producing our own food. I urge the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield me about 2 minutes?

Mr. HRUSKA. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I only wish to commend the Senator from Nebraska and the Senator from South Dakota for proposing their amendment. Also, I think the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] has ably and eloquently stated the case.

In the first place, I see no justification whatsoever for putting cotton and textiles in a special category, and not in-

cluding some other products and raw materials from farms in a category of concern. I think that is what the amendment by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] does.

Unfortunately, in the negotiations respecting the Common Market we have observed our negotiators under this administration sweep the agricultural problem under the rug, meanwhile attempting to negotiate on industrial products. It is high time that the administration realized there is a farm or agricultural situation which has to be dealt with practically and realistically.

I only wish to say, without taking more time, I wholeheartedly support the amendment offered by the Senators from Nebraska and South Dakota. Again I congratulate them for offering it, and I thank them for their interest.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield me 2 or 3 minutes?

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Kansas.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Kansas is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] for offering the amendment to the proposed legislation. I think it points up a problem with which we shall be confronted as we attempt to deal with future trade program in respect to the Common Market and other countries.

I have had grave concern, because I think we are in great danger, from an agricultural standpoint, of being out-traded in the Common Market and in other markets.

I have no criticism of the cotton people or any who have already reached international agreements, but I am concerned about the fact that there was a rather extensive round of negotiations with the Common Market representatives in Paris in January of this year.

Representatives of our State Department and other top officials of our Government were at the negotiations. They were able to negotiate agreements on cotton and some noncompetitive farm crops.

I noticed—and I say this with great regret—that at these negotiations action was deferred on feed grains and wheat, which represent a substantial part of our exports not only to the Common Market countries, but also to other countries.

It appears to me that today at least we should serve notice on the State Department and on our own negotiators that we expect them to protect the interest of agriculture as they get into future negotiations. If we do not, the farmers of this Nation may be traded down the river as the United States goes into a new trade program.

I would not for one moment wish to have anybody believe that I am not sympathetic toward a trade program with Common Market countries and with other nations. I think we must trade in

the world in which we live at the present time. I am concerned, however, about some of the commodities coming into this Nation at the present time.

The Kansas Livestock Association, at its annual convention in Wichita, Kansas, recently expressed concern and adopted a resolution suggesting that every effort should be made to protect the U.S. producers against the ever-increasing imports of farm commodities, particularly livestock and livestock products, which are affecting our markets at this time.

Mr. President, there are some favorable prospects for trade with the Common Market countries, particularly in regard to cotton, as has been mentioned, and hides, skins, tallow, and certain fruits and vegetables but there are some questionable projects. These questionable projects cover items which make up approximately 30 percent of our agricultural exports. Included in the group are wheat, flour, feed grains, rice, poultry, and meat. We sold to the European Economic Community over \$300 million worth of these products in 1960.

Mr. President, I think it is timely that the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] is before the Senate, though I do not think it goes far enough. I think the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] has offered an amendment which certainly is very mild in character. It merely points up a problem which will confront the Congress and the Nation as we consider future trade programs. We must write proper trade legislation in this session of Congress, or there will be some serious effects on the agricultural production of our Nation by 1970.

I thank the Senator from Nebraska for yielding me this time.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. President, first I wish to say that my colleague [Mr. ERVIN] asked me to express his regret that he could not be present to speak in respect to the proposed legislation this morning. I am sure Senators join me in extending sympathy to my colleague and to his family, since this morning his brother's wife is being buried in his native town. Otherwise he would be present.

Mr. President, the textile problem has been before the Senate and before the executive branch of the Government ever since I have been a Member of Congress. It is one of the problems of long standing in America. The industry is one of the largest employers of people, and it affects a great many. As a Senator pointed out yesterday, this industry is rated as the number two manufacturing defense industry of the United States, in the event there should be a war and a need to supply our troops, as well as our allies, as we supplied them in the last war.

The Pastore committee was appointed by legislation. The committee made an exhaustive study of the problems of the textile industry. That inquiry did not pertain only to cotton, but included the whole textile industry. Hearings were held in New England, all over the South, and wherever textiles were being manu-

factured and were a major part of the economy. I attended some of the hearings myself. All the information which could possibly be obtained was gathered. Japanese witnesses, who were interested in what might be done by legislation which would affect imports from Japan, were heard. Representatives from other nations came before the committee to be heard. New England, the South, and every other area was represented in the hearings.

After much study and many hearings the committee made a report, which was partially implemented this year and last year by agreements which were reached in Geneva, after many trips by members of the Commerce Department and of the State Department, in an endeavor to work out some kind of mutual agreement which would not upset world trade but which would at the same time protect the textile industry of the United States.

A voluntary agreement was finally reached with 18 other nations. Including the United States, 19 different countries, the major producers of textiles in the world, made the agreement.

When the negotiations started, the textile industry wished to include all textiles: wools, manmade fibers, and silk, as well as cotton. It was finally determined it would be impossible to reach an agreement on all forms of textiles, because it was difficult enough to reach an agreement on one phase of textiles.

Wool, for instance, plays an important part in the economic life of some foreign countries. I do not know of any industry in the United States which is in worse shape than the wool industry. I know of one plant owned by the Burlington Mills Corp.—the Peerless Woolen Mills plant, the largest woolen mill in the United States—which was liquidated in the last year because it could not effectively compete with foreign textiles.

I am told that the imports of woolen goods into this country now equal about 50 percent of the woolen goods consumed in the United States. The American wool industry is in serious trouble.

Manmade fibers increasingly are getting into trouble due to foreign competition.

The American Textile Institute, representatives of the Commerce Department, representatives of the State Department, and representatives of all other agencies involved, working together, found it would be impossible to negotiate an agreement on all types of textiles at one time, so it was agreed to negotiate the agreement in respect to cotton only; that is, cotton yarns, cotton fabrics, and manufactured finished cotton garments.

On a short-term basis 18 nations have entered into an agreement, which will end the latter part of this year. A 5-year agreement was negotiated which will go into effect at the end of the short-term agreement. Those agreements have been fairly well lived up to. One of the countries has considerably overshipped its agreed quota. The Department of Commerce has taken steps to see that the situation is remedied promptly. About 2 months ago one of the other nations that entered into the

agreement far exceeded the amount it had agreed it would ship into this country. The Department of Commerce immediately took hold of that situation, and the goods were not even permitted to land in the United States.

The countries that signed the agreement were Australia, Austria, Canada, Denmark, India, Japan, Norway, Pakistan, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, the United Kingdom—also representing Hong Kong—the United States, and the member states of the European Economic Community, Belgium, France, Germany, Italy, Luxembourg, and the Netherlands.

Those countries produce 90 percent of the free world trade in textiles. Those agreements are now in effect. They are operating reasonably well, and will continue to operate satisfactorily.

However, very recently a problem developed which was not contemplated at the time the agreement was made. Israel, Egypt, Taiwan—that is, Formosa—and Colombia, which were never, to any extent, exporters of textiles into the United States prior to the agreement, have now become major exporters of textiles into the United States.

Some strong evidence exists that perhaps one or two of the countries that entered into the agreement, pursuant to which they promised they would not ship more than their quota into the United States, are now shipping goods to one of the countries I named, from which they are then transshipped into the United States. In other words, in the agreement we might have left the back door open. If the situation should continue, the countries that have entered into the agreement might feel that they are not being treated fairly. Their reaction could completely wreck the voluntary agreement that has now been established. All we are asking through the proposed legislation is that areas that are not covered under the voluntary agreement be brought in by law. The President has authority to negotiate with them and prevent such countries from abusing the objects sought.

I am thoroughly in sympathy with the desires of my good friend, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], and other cosponsors of the amendment. I know full well that industries in their States need protection. I also know that a great many other products need protection. I am thoroughly in sympathy with the producers of wood products, whose problems have been discussed. At one time North Carolina was a large producer of plywood veneer. Importations of that particular product have almost completely wrecked that industry in North Carolina. I should be glad to support any kind of legitimate proposed legislation which would protect those people, because they need protection.

As the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] said, our farm products and other commodities will need protection, and we must see that they receive it.

North Carolina, like other States on the eastern seaboard, produces a large amount of fish meal and fish oil. Those products are of vital importance to the

economies of those States. That market has been almost completely wrecked by the importation of fish meal. That is another product that we should study. There are many others.

Last week I discussed on the floor of the Senate the importation of mirrors. The mirror industry in the United States is a large one. The largest mirror factory in the United States is situated in North Carolina. A number of smaller factories producing mirrors are also located in my State. Those factories are threatened with being put completely out of business unless they get some protection in the way of tariff quotas or some similar relief later.

Mr. President, I do not think those commodities should be added to the proposed legislation now before the Senate. To add them would completely stifle the effort that is being made by the administration to take care of the one product named at this time.

I reiterate that when another measure which is appropriate is offered, I shall be glad to join my good friends in helping them to have the commodities in which they are interested added, because I know that they, too, need protection. But I do not think the amendment should be added to the present bill, because it would not help the products that Senators are trying to help, and the amendment would probably ruin the negotiations that have been carried on and the agreements that have been entered into with respect to cotton textiles. The agreement is now already set up and is operating.

All we need to do is to close the back door, through which many of the commodities are coming in. If we do not do so, the operations of the volunteer agreements that are now covered by the Geneva agreement might be affected.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JORDAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MILLER. What the Senator has said would appeal to me much more if the bill related to cotton textiles, but it does not. It covers the whole gamut, because it would amend section 204. There is no provision in the bill that I can see that states anything about textiles. I know as a practical fact that the only agreements that have been negotiated relate to textiles, but the bill goes far beyond that point. It seems to me that in view of the comprehensive nature of the bill, it would be entirely proper to cover other commodities than only textiles. In fact, I believe that probably is the intention behind the amendment offered by the distinguished majority whip, which seeks to cover more than textiles.

If the bill were amended to cover textiles specifically, I would be somewhat persuaded by what the Senator from North Carolina has said. But in view of the way the bill is now drawn, so that it would cover everything that section 204 embraces, it seems to me that it would be entirely appropriate to bring in other commodities than textiles.

Mr. JORDAN. The Mundt amendment reads, in part:

Provided, however, That no agreement in regard to cotton and cotton textiles shall be enforced pursuant to the provisions of this section until such time as the President has negotiated agreements with representatives of foreign nations limiting in like manner the export to the United States from foreign countries of the following commodities:

Negotiations for the textile agreement have been proceeding for at least 4 years. That much time has been required to bring the agreement to where it is now. If we were required to go back and negotiate with reference to all the different products now named with foreign nations, years might pass before the present agreements with the countries that are in effect and those that could be brought in under the bill which is being introduced could go into effect. During that time the countries that are now bringing into our country commodities that are not covered by the agreement could completely wreck the agreement that has already been set up. I do not wish to see the statement made, "You shall not do these things until certain other things are done."

I am fully in sympathy with the producers of beef. Incidentally, North Carolina is a large beef-producing State. We do not raise too many sheep. However, I know that those producers need protection, too. I am willing to assist in anything that can be done to see that those industries are protected, because they need protection.

I do not believe the pending bill is the one to which this amendment should be attached, because it simply would hamstring what has been done.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JORDAN. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Is it not fair for me to say that the Mundt amendment is punitive in nature? It says, in effect, "We realize it is true that you people have worked out a multilateral agreement, which cannot be perfected under the present language of section 204 of the act because it is not a bilateral agreement. We realize all that. We realize that you have made a great struggle for 4 years. You have made this effort and you have brought this matter to the attention of a Republican administration at first, and then later to the attention of a Democratic administration. We realize all that. Furthermore, you have not only done all that, but back in 1958 a resolution was introduced creating a committee to make a thorough study of the textile industry. You have done all that. In 1959 that committee issued a report. In 1961 it issued another report. Then still another report was issued by the committee in 1962. We realize that you went to all that trouble and what is more, you brought 19 nations together with whom you negotiated a multilateral agreement. However, we are saying to you now that you cannot do anything about it until you go out and get one of these agreements for us."

I say to the proponents of the Mundt amendment that that is unfair. If the proponents were to say, "We too have an agreement, and we want to be included," that would be another matter entirely.

That would be equitable. That would be all right with us.

However, they are saying, "We realize the fact that you have a multilateral agreement, but you cannot implement that agreement so that it becomes effective, even though you represent an industry in trouble, until you go out and get one of these agreements for us also. If you do not do that for us, you cannot get the help you want, and you must be allowed to die." And we do not want to die.

If the proponents were to take the position taken by the proponents of the amendment submitted by the majority whip, which has been mentioned here earlier, and were to say, "We feel that the cattle industry is in bad shape, too, and you ought to give us a chance to try to negotiate one of these agreements for us," that would be all right. That would not stop us.

The proponents of the Mundt amendment are being somewhat punitive. I think it is absolutely unfair on their part to take that attitude. That is the fault I find with the Mundt amendment, that it is punitive. I do not believe they should do that to the textile industry.

They are saying, "We know you are in a very difficult situation with respect to textiles, and we recognize that many people have been thrown out of work, and that you went to the trouble of going to the White House, and you did all that, whereas we did not do any of that, but you can't do anything about this until you get one of these agreements for us."

We did take action 4 years ago. At that time we took the matter to President Eisenhower, and later we took it to President Kennedy. We brought representatives of industry and of labor to Washington and went to the White House. The proponents of the Mundt amendment have not done that. Now they come to the floor and say, "You cannot do this until you get an agreement for us."

How unfair can anyone be?

Mr. JORDAN. As the Senator well knows, because he conducted hearings, before any of these agreements were reached, we had reached a kind of voluntary agreement with Japan. Is that not correct?

Mr. PASTORE. We had a voluntary agreement.

Mr. JORDAN. That was prior to reaching the multilateral agreement.

Mr. PASTORE. We had reached an agreement with Japan on a 5-year basis. That was a voluntary agreement. It limited exports to this country from Japan to the tune of 235 million yards of cotton cloth. Then 2 years before the agreement expired they asked for an amendment to the agreement, and it was increased to limit exports to 247 million yards of cloth. Then the agreement ran out. That would have meant that we would have been faced with disaster if we were unable to work out some kind of agreement.

That is what we have done, Mr. President. That is all we have done. We have had to close down 800 mills in this country. Four hundred thousand people

have lost their jobs. At the present time we have 2,100,000 people employed in the textile industry.

If the bill is not passed as we have presented it we will jeopardize the future of those families.

I remind Senators that I have voted for support programs in the agricultural field, for programs which meant little or nothing to the State of Rhode Island. We have been on the floor helping the interests of the States represented by the sponsors of the Mundt amendment. I ask them not to punish us today. That is what they are doing. They are punishing us today because they have not received relief. I say to them, "Go out and get your relief. I will help you get it, but do not kill us off."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JORDAN. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to say to the Senator from Rhode Island that we from New England approached the former occupant of the White House, and then also the present occupant of the White House on this problem. Then we worked this matter out as a group, regardless of partisanship. This effort has been made over a number of years.

Mr. PASTORE. Since 1958. I have just said that.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. We went to work on that problem, because we have seen the textile industry in New England handicapped by inability to get new machinery, handicapped by foreign imports, and by lower prices. We have seen mills close down and workers lose their jobs. The bill would help the industry continue to live, at least to remain in existence.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator is absolutely correct. I would like to say also that we had before our committee the largest manufacturer of woolen products in the country. These woolen people have been in our ranks, and that is why I am surprised by this move on the part of the supporters of the Mundt amendment. This manufacturer said to me, "God forbid that we should have a major conflict tomorrow and the country be compelled to call up 10 million boys and put them into the armed services of the country. If we had to do that, we wouldn't have the cloth in this country, and we would not have the machinery in this country, and we would not have the mills in this country to make the clothes and the blankets to keep these boys warm." That is how bad it is. We are trying to help that situation. We negotiated agreements with countries that are exporting 90 percent of the textile goods that come into this country. Of course, there will always be loopholes. We know that there are three or four countries that have not been brought into these agreements, because they were not exporting at the time. The minute these countries begin to export, it will throw the whole thing off, and it will become lopsided. That is why we are trying to protect the agreement, so that these other countries cannot come in through subterfuge or a loophole and take advantage of the situation. That is what we are trying to do. That is all it amounts to.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JORDAN. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from Rhode Island mentioned wool. Is it not true that we worked out an agreement with Australia a number of years ago with relation to subsidies on wool that came in from Australia, so that our woolgrowers in the western part of the country would be able to compete and continue in the business of raising sheep and producing wool?

Mr. PASTORE. Absolutely.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. We worked on that from the point of view of New Englanders helping the sheep-growing industry in the western part of the country. At the same time we permitted bringing in Australian wool where it was helpful to do so.

Mr. PASTORE. Yes. We made that kind of agreement against our own self-interest, too, because domestically produced wool is more expensive by reason of the differential in the pay rates. We know that for the time being it is always a little attractive to buy cheaper. In the long run, however, what are we doing? How is anyone going to buy anything if he does not have a job? How can a man buy anything when he does not have a job that pays him something?

This is not a political question. The very genesis of the bill comes from a Republican mind. This is not a Democratic movement. The Senator who submitted the resolution was the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Corron]. He stood on the floor of the Senate with former Senator Payne, of Maine, and they suggested that perhaps I would make a good chairman of a committee to study this whole matter. That task was assigned to me. I say with considerable pride that I believe we have done a respectably good job.

We called in witnesses from every facet of the textile industry, and we listened to all of them. We went to the White House. We went to the places where the mills are located, and we talked to the workers and to management. We went to the White House to see President Eisenhower. He appointed what is known as an interagency committee. We asked him to appoint a permanent one, but he appointed an ad hoc committee. That did not work out. Then President Kennedy came into office, and we took the matter up with him. He appointed a Cabinet Committee, and it restudied the subject.

Then it was suggested that possibly it would not be right and would not be in keeping with our system to provide for mandatory quotas. He said:

Let us try voluntary quotas.

This was done. In May 1961 he issued his seven-point program.

Among the points was point 6, which had to do with calling a conference in Geneva of all the nations in the world which were exporting textiles to the United States. We sat down with those people. We faced a hard task. Do Senators think we got the best of it? Of course we did not. We achieved a little

limitation. They wanted to gage the program according to the imports of 1960, which was a bloated year. We said that that would be unfair. Finally we agreed upon fiscal year 1961. So the agreement is based on the imports of fiscal year 1961. Our industry is not happy about that. I am not particularly happy about it. Nevertheless, it is an accomplishment, and we are trying today to do what is necessary to preserve that small accomplishment.

Mr. SALTONSTALL and Mr. HRUSKA addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. PASTORE. I do not think I have the floor; but if I have the floor, I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts for a question.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I join with other Senators in commending the Senator from Rhode Island for what he accomplished as chairman of the committee. We worked, first, on a voluntary basis, because our negotiations were principally with Japan. When it was found that that arrangement would not work because of the activities of other countries, then we sought to reach a multilateral agreement in Geneva, and in accomplishing that the Senator from Rhode Island had much to do.

That agreement will not work unless we have the pending amendment agreed to today. It will mean so much for so many of our people in New England who work in the textile industry.

Mr. PASTORE. More than that, when we began this crusade—and I use the word advisedly, because it was a crusade—Japan exported 75 percent of all the textile imports into this country. But then the picture began to change, because Hong Kong came into it, and Hong Kong began to export to the United States. Japan's 75 percent of the entire quantity which came to the United States dropped to 38 percent—only in percentage; in quantity, it was even more. That gives an idea of how bad the situation became. Finally the United States became inundated with imports, and our mills began to close. Something had to be done. This is a national problem, not merely a local one.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is it not correct to say that Hong Kong undercut Japan?

Mr. PASTORE. That is correct. Then the Philippines came into the picture; now Egypt has come into it. Everybody is fighting for his share of the market of the American consumers. I say "look out; do not kill the goose that laid the golden egg."

Mr. JORDAN. I should like to address a question to the Senator from Rhode Island, because he was the chairman of the committee which conducted the hearings. Under the arrangement, Japan made a voluntary agreement with the United States that it would export to the United States so many yards of cotton cloth. As the Senator stated, the amount was later raised. What wrecked the Japanese arrangement was that although the Jap-

anese lived up to their agreement, other nations began to ship their products to the United States. But originally, the Japanese were the principal exporters to the United States.

Mr. PASTORE. Yes; but that 5-year voluntary agreement on the part of Japan expired on June 30, 1961. That is why it is necessary to enter into the agreement now proposed.

Mr. JORDAN. That is exactly correct.

Mr. PASTORE. That is why I said the floodgates have all been opened.

Certainly the Senators from the agricultural States deserve relief and attention; but there is a way to get it. Please do not work against us.

Mr. HRUSKA. That is the point about which I wish to speak.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina has the floor.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina yield?

Mr. JORDAN. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. JORDAN. As much time as the Senator wishes.

Mr. MILLER. In response to the comments of the Senator from Rhode Island about why we from the agricultural States have not gone to the White House to try to obtain some relief for agriculture, things are a little different today from what they were in the days when the White House was occupied by President Eisenhower. We say that the responsibility is now that of the other party, and since the administration now is under the control of the Democratic Party we expect Senators of that party to go to the White House and intercede for agriculture. We did the same thing for them with respect to textiles when President Eisenhower was in the White House.

Mr. PASTORE. Has the Senator from Iowa ever asked me to go? Let him ask me to go, and I will go.

Mr. MILLER. We expect the administration, through the Department of Agriculture, to take such action. But when we write to the Department of Agriculture and point out the impact that imports are having on domestic production, to the harm of our agricultural products, does the Senator know what response we get? We are told that the condition is not serious; therefore, we get no relief.

Mr. PASTORE. Has the President ever told the Senator that?

Mr. MILLER. We hope the Senator from Rhode Island will help us to get some action with respect to our problem, if not through the Department of Agriculture, then through the White House.

Mr. PASTORE. I shall be glad to do what I can. Only yesterday was it called to my attention for the first time.

The Senator speaks of a different occupant of the White House. Mr. Kennedy has been there only since January 1961. Do not tell me that this problem

has grown up only as of then. It has been with us a long time. Where was the Senator when Mr. Eisenhower was in the White House?

Mr. MILLER. I was not even here then.

Mr. PASTORE. But the Senator's colleagues were.

Mr. MILLER. The Senator from Iowa wishes the Senator from Rhode Island to know that the Senator from Iowa is in sympathy with his problem and wants to do something about it; but I point out that one reason for the Mundt amendment is that agriculture has been ignored, so far as the present administration is concerned, when it comes to the impact of imports on our surpluses.

Men who are far more expert in agriculture than I ever will be have told me that if we had not been importing such large amounts of foodstuffs from other countries, we would not have the problem of surpluses.

Mr. PASTORE. I realize that. I am not quarreling. I am simply asking Senators not to kill us off because they have a problem. Their action today is rather punitive. They are saying that the textile industry is in trouble; that they realize we have a multilateral agreement; but that we cannot do anything about it until we get them such an agreement. I ask, Why proceed in that way?

Mr. MILLER. With respect to the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]—

Mr. PASTORE. I shall support it.

Mr. MILLER. That is exactly why I am concerned about the situation. That amendment is meaningless because it provides, "when in his judgment such imports seriously affect domestic producers." Obviously, the President has made a judgment long ago that the imports do not seriously affect domestic producers.

Mr. PASTORE. When did the President of the United States make the judgment which the Senator from Iowa just stated? Tell me the time and place of the judgment.

Mr. MILLER. The President's own Secretary of Agriculture made it.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator said the President of the United States made it. When did the President make that judgment?

Mr. MILLER. The Secretary of Agriculture speaks for the President on these questions.

Mr. PASTORE. The Secretary of Agriculture cannot speak for the President on this question, because the language provides that the President of the United States shall make the judgment. Let us not shift from one argument to another.

As I said before, the amendment proposed to be offered by the Senator from Minnesota is a fair, frank, equitable amendment. It puts the problem right in the lap of the President of the United States, where it should be.

Mr. MILLER. I think it would be much better, more effective, and more satisfactory, if it were in the lap of Congress rather than in the lap of the

President. That is the objection I have to the Humphrey amendment.

I thank the Senator from North Carolina for yielding.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina yield?

Mr. JORDAN. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. HRUSKA. I thank the Senator from North Carolina. I simply wish to make a point with respect to some of the inquiries and statements made by the Senator from Rhode Island.

First, it is said that this is a crusade, that it is not a political question, that all cotton folk seek to do is to protect their gains. It is said that it is not a political question because the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] started this movement some 3 or 4 years ago. He did. All that the representatives of the so-called cotton and cotton textile States wish to do is to protect their gains; that is all, it is said.

Mr. President, all we who support the Mundt amendment seek to do it to make these gains, which are granted by the President of the United States under section 204, available to the rest of the agricultural States and agricultural sectors.

It is said that the Mundt amendment is a punitive measure; that it is obstructive and will not permit the cotton textile industry to go forward after years of negotiations in reaching the agreement to which reference is made in the original Mundt amendment. That is not true, because, as modified, there are two additional alternatives which the President may turn to in order to put the cotton textile agreement into effect. First, he can enter into similar agreements with respect to other commodities, or make a bona fide effort to negotiate such agreements. If he fails, he may then put the cotton textile agreement into effect. Or, if he makes a finding that the imports of commodities listed in the bill do not seriously affect domestic producers, then he may put the cotton textile agreement into force.

It is not obstructive. It is a reasonable way of asking the President to exert on behalf of the rest of agriculture the same solicitude and compassion, that he has exerted on behalf of cotton. And here is where we get to the politics of the matter—

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. HRUSKA. After I make my next point.

Mr. PASTORE. Very well.

Mr. HRUSKA. It is said that the other agricultural producers did not go to the White House; that they did not appoint a commission and did not exert all of the efforts to secure this same protection as the cotton people are getting. But, actually, we have been making such efforts for years. It is a matter of record, not only in the Tariff Commission, but also in the Department of Agriculture and here in Congress.

I shall state where we were not when this happened. We were not a member of the group about which the Senator

from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] yesterday spoke of as follows:

As realists we are all more or less familiar with what has happened. The textile industry is a powerful industry. Senators and Representatives represent textile districts in New England, the Middle States, and now the Southern States as well. In order to placate them and get them to support trade expansion, the Department of State and the Department of Commerce negotiated agreements with the European Economic Community and with other areas.

The congressional representatives of the other agricultural areas did not join this group in trading their votes for the trade expansion bill as the senior Senator from Illinois alleges, this in order to get Executive clemency of this kind. This Executive compassion and solicitude was accorded only one selected industry within the field of agriculture. I say that is where we were not. We were not trading our votes for the trade expansion bill in order to get the Executive to agree to a protectionist measure that out-McKinleys McKinley.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina yield?

Mr. JORDAN. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I merely wish to state that the Senator from Nebraska is indulging in an assertion, not the statement of a fact. There has been no trade. I do not know whether he has read the reports of our committee. We issued the first one on February 4, 1959; we issued the second one in April 1961; and we issued the last one in April 1962.

In my own State of Rhode Island, 45 percent of our entire economy came from the textile industry when I was Governor of the State; but now it has slumped down to 15 percent. So when the Senator from Nebraska states that what we are doing is "cementing our gains," I respectfully suggest that the Senator from Nebraska has not read the record. What we are trying to do here is preserve our very life.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina yield further time to me?

Mr. JORDAN. I yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. Let me say that I did not make the statement attributed to me. I did not say that those in this industry are attempting to cement their gains. I did not say that a "deal" was made by the congressional representatives of the cotton-textile producing States. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] made those statements.

Mr. PASTORE. That is true; but the making of the statement does not establish that as a fact, because regardless of whether the Senator from Illinois or anyone else made such a statement, I am saying categorically that it is not the truth.

Mr. HRUSKA. Succeeding events, when we take up the trade expansion bill, will prove whether it is the truth.

Mr. PASTORE. And we shall wait and see.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK in the chair). The Senator from South Dakota is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I think we are gradually clearing up the issues involved in this discussion.

Let me say that some of the Senators on the opposition side have left the floor; but some of them are still on the floor, so I shall address myself first to exactly what concerns us here today.

First, let me say there is nothing even remotely punitive about the proposal we have submitted—an amendment to provide for agriculture generally the consideration which it is now proposed to give to the textile industry. I state frankly that if because the proponents say it is the wise thing to do, or if because the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] was correct when he said commitments have been made and vote trades have been concluded, or if for any other reason they succeed in excluding the rest of the agricultural industry from the benefits of this protective measure, as one Senator I shall still vote for the measure, because the textile industry is in trouble and I am not going to assume a dog-in-the-manger attitude. But I do not think this is wise legislation or prudent legislation or proper legislation.

I think the correctness of that statement is illustrated rather clearly by the alternative which has been offered us by means of the amendment in the nature of a substitute which has been proposed to my amendment by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. The Humphrey-Morse amendment in the nature of a substitute would not add one scintilla of authority or power, I submit, to what the President now has; it would not change the picture in any way, shape, or form. In my opinion the amendment in the nature of a substitute is simply what could be called a robber-baron amendment—an amendment to rob the Senate of the opportunity to do its duty through voting on the amendment submitted by my associates and myself—an amendment which would broaden this measure and would extend it to all segments of agriculture. Ours is a meaningful amendment, the substitute amendment is meaningless.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time the Senator from South Dakota has yielded to himself has expired.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes more.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I understand that Senators on the other side of the aisle who are vitally interested in the textile industry and who are also vitally interested in the problems of the poultry industry and the cattle industry and the dairy and timber industries—and the timber industry is in just as bad a situation, as I pointed out statistically yesterday, as is the textile industry—would like to find some convenient way to becloud the issue, so as to be able to tell their people back home, "I did something for the rest of

you." The Humphrey-Morse amendment is a device to achieve this purpose.

So I think the issue should be made crystal clear in the public print, so that those who read it later, in the agonizing moments when they face vanishing profits and bankruptcy, because their particular industry has not been protected, although the textile industry has been protected, will know just what the situation here is. I say without fear of the possibility of successful challenge or contradiction that the Humphrey-Morse amendment in the nature of a substitute does not add 1 ounce of authority to the authority the President already has—authority which he could have exercised last year or yesterday in the absence of the Humphrey-Morse amendment in the nature of a substitute. Nothing new is being added by the substitute proposed.

So the question is whether we really want to do something for any other segment of the agricultural industry which is suffering from imports, except the textile industry; and I say this as one who, if we are defeated, still will vote in favor of protecting the textile industry. Then we shall observe the vote of this body as the Senator from Nebraska has recommended, when the roll is called, several weeks from now, on the question of passage of the President's proposal to strip the Congress and the Tariff Commission of any authority to deal with these tariffs, and we shall then watch to see whether Senators, will justify the charge which has been made by the Senator from Illinois, or whether by their votes they will repudiate it. That will be the test of the correctness of what the Senator from Illinois has said—which, as of now, is merely an allegation. When the votes are cast at that time, we shall be able to determine definitely whether the rest of agriculture is being sold out to free trade and ruinous imports, in order to protect temporarily, and in only a minor degree, the textile industry as proposed in the committee bill before us.

I know what the problems of the timber industry are; and we can do something about them today; or we can vote for this "robber baron" amendment in the nature of a substitute, which has been submitted, and thus do nothing about the problems of the timber industry.

I know something about the problems of the dairy and poultry industries. The Members of Congress who come from States producing these products have been busy; they have been walking on the same paths and knocking on the same doors and making their requests and offering their suggestions; but they have not been offering to make any trades for votes. And they have failed.

Today they have a chance to do something effective to help their constituents by voting for my amendment.

I confess that as my amendment originally stood, as was pointed out by the Senator from Florida and one or two other Senators, it might be considered that there was something obstructionist and punitive about it. And so, in a

spirit of conciliation, in an effort to help the textile industry and the other industries at the same time, with no obstructionism involved, we got together later yesterday afternoon and remodified the amendment. We changed it, and eliminated any possibility of its being considered punitive or obstructionist, because we simply now seek to provide, ultimately, that we shall at least have an opportunity to do for the rest of the agricultural industry, the timber, poultry, cattle, sheep, pork, and dairy product producers, and the rest, something similar to what it is proposed we do now for the textile industry, because we leave the textile protecting language intact. We simply say that this agreement shall not be made operative until agreements have been negotiated on "beef and beef products, pork and pork products, fresh and frozen lamb, poultry and poultry products, timber and timber products, and dairy products." Those products have been brought into the picture, or we say, because we do not want to be obstructionist, "until the President has exerted bona fide efforts to negotiate such agreements as to those commodities and has failed therein."

This provision will not hold up action. The President can get the interested parties together to negotiate within a week's time. The textile people would still have what they want to have, but they would not have it by ruling out the rest of the agricultural industry. Then, to be completely fair, to be completely cooperative, to be sure we are not holding up needed relief for the textile industry, we added another modification, another provision, which says:

Or [when the President] makes a finding that imports of such commodities do not seriously affect domestic producers.

He has made an adverse finding on some of these products several times, through the Department of Agriculture. As the Senator from Iowa believes I think he was wrong. But if the President makes such findings, and signs them, and stands by them, textile producers can have their textile protective relief while the rest of the country goes free trade. Our amendment would not destroy his authority to act.

That is the issue involved. Do we want to do something about it? The case of the Burlington Mills has been cited. I do not think they are going to get help, because they are "kaput" now. As the Senator from North Carolina said, silk and wool, and manmade fabrics have been excluded from the act. So it gets down to cotton and textiles.

I read the statistics in the RECORD yesterday relating to the Simpson Lumber Co. of Washington, pointing out the problems it has involving imports. We propose to give the Senate an opportunity to do something for the timber industry, and not only for the Northwest, but for American timber generally because there is a timber industry in other parts of the country. We do not happen to produce Douglas-fir, but we happen to raise a lot of ponderosa pine.

We are faced with some import problems also.

The question arises, Do we want to single out the textile industry for tariff protection, since we are about to be asked to vote for an international trade policy which puts complete, unchallengeable control in the hands of the President, and leave out the dairy people, the livestock people, and the timber people? I think this is the only chance we will have to do something about these products. We are told the votes are available to strip the power from Congress to regulate international trade. This may be the last chance any Senator has to protect his industry. Here it is. We want to do it without hurting the cotton people. We want to do it through action that has nothing punitive or obstructive in it. We think our amendment will achieve these results.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. My committee has been holding a series of hearings, both here and in the field, on the timber situation.

Mr. MUNDT. In my remarks of yesterday, I quoted from the presentation made in the committee.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We have not completed the hearings, but I think we are pretty well informed as to the problems. The facts are not disputed at all. There are several facets of the problem. One is transportation costs. Another is the problem of stumpage practices, which are different in Canada from what they are in the United States.

Mr. MUNDT. One is the wage rate differential.

Mr. MAGNUSON. There is not much difference in the wages paid.

Mr. MUNDT. The testimony seemed to indicate there was.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Well, actually, there is none.

Mr. MUNDT. If the Senator, who represents a State with a great timber industry, says that the wage differential does not affect the industry in his State, I point out that it does in my State.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Very well. That may be one facet of the problem, but it is not the major one. The real problem is that Canada has again devalued its dollar, so that we are working under a 7½-percent difference. The Senator from North Carolina, as a very successful and able businessman, knows that a 7½-percent differential makes the difference between whether a business can compete in any line of endeavor and cannot. The question of quotas or tariffs, and matters of that kind, also is one problem. Our serious problem is the fact that the Canadians have usurped our domestic market in the East.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MAGNUSON. May I have an additional 2 minutes?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Washington. Perhaps the Senator from North Carolina can yield him 2 minutes. Then we both can listen to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Ninety percent of the timber that is shipped east goes by rail. So there is a transportation rate problem involved. The other timber is shipped by water, where we have the question of the Jones Act and chartered foreign ships. The basic problem is the usurpation of the eastern market for western lumber. It goes as high as 55 or 60 percent. I will put the figures into the RECORD later.

Mr. MUNDT. I put them in the RECORD yesterday.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I quote from the report:

The bill would authorize the President, for the purpose of carrying out any agreement under section 204—

And I add there my own words that forestry and timber have apparently been declared to be agricultural products.

Mr. MUNDT. May I say that question is still in doubt. We discussed it in great detail in the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. We have not been able to get a satisfactory definition.

Mr. JORDAN. I am going to help the Senator there, because we ought to have one.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I continue to read from the report:

The bill would authorize the President to limit the importation of any agricultural commodity or product covered by such agreement from countries not participating in the agreement.

Is Canada in or out of the agreement?

Mr. MUNDT. Canada is in the agreement.

Mr. JORDAN. Canada is in the textile agreement.

Mr. MAGNUSON. So Canada would be involved in this particular matter?

Mr. MUNDT. No, because the agreement deals only with textiles. That is the only commodity as to which we have the multilateral agreement.

Mr. MAGNUSON. How would the Senator's amendment give some comfort to the Senator from Washington in the hope that we could get at the problem of importation of lumber from Canada to the eastern market?

Mr. MUNDT. It would then be possible for the President to make it mandatory; really, for him to try to get multilateral agreements, and would give him the power, if he gets them, to provide safety insurance, which I think the President needs. This provides that when there is a multilateral agreement, if a country which has not signed it wants to move in and violate it, the President has an opportunity to stop it.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. This would be for the benefit not of cotton only but all agriculture.

Mr. MAGNUSON. As is true of the Senator from South Dakota, I have gone through these textile problems before. My committee has studied them. As he believes, I, too, think something should be done.

We also have a problem with respect to lumber. This is primarily a Canadian-United States problem. Even if

the Congress can solve some of the problems in respect to it, there will remain the 7½-percent differential.

Mr. MUNDT. That will not be the case if the amendment is agreed to, as the Senator from Nebraska and I and other Senators have offered it. The President then would have the authority to say to Canada, "Look, if you are going to devalue your currency we will increase the tariff to compensate for such action." It would have nothing to do with the railroad rates.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think that quotas would be better than tariffs. Would the President have authority in that field?

Mr. HRUSKA. If the amendment which has been proposed and which we hope will be adopted is agreed to, yes. Negotiations would not be conducted on the basis of tariffs alone. Nontariff restrictions could also be considered. Tariffs are outmoded. They are no longer the principal consideration.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes, in many respects tariffs are outmoded.

Mr. HRUSKA. They are outmoded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Nebraska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. HRUSKA. In further answer to the question of the Senator from Washington as to how the timber industry could be helped by the Mundt amendment, I suggest it could be helped in this way: The Mundt amendment merely provides that the cotton textile agreement would not go into force and effect until one of three things happened.

A similar agreement could be entered into on other agricultural products.

Recognizing that this might take considerable time and might be obstructive in nature, another alternative is provided whereby the President can make a bona fide attempt to enter into such agreements and fail in this attempt.

The third alternative is that the President could find that the importation of such commodities is not causing serious injury to domestic producers.

This is not an obstructive proposal. It is constructive. We want to provide the other sectors of agriculture with the same benefits the proposed bill would give to one particular industry.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Timber would be within the category of agricultural products?

Mr. HRUSKA. Yes. There is no question about it.

Mr. MUNDT. We spell that out in the amendment, which includes "timber and timber products." We do not rely on an indefinite definition, but spell it out specifically.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield for a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. Has my time expired?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time yielded has expired. The Senator has 40 minutes remaining. How much time does the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. How much time does the Senator from North Carolina have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Twenty-eight minutes.

Mr. MUNDT. Since I have more time, I yield.

Mr. JORDAN. I did not wish to ask the Senator to yield on his time, if he is short of time.

Mr. MUNDT. For a brief question I am glad to yield.

Mr. JORDAN. The point we may be overlooking is that the cotton textile industry already has an agreement with 90 percent of the textile-producing people of the world. The 10 percent, which no one thought was even worth negotiating with, can wreck the whole program. Egypt was not shipping any yarn until the last year, and neither was Israel. Israel is now becoming an exporter. The same is true with respect to Formosa. The United States has been exporting cotton to Formosa in order to clothe the soldiers there, yet now Formosa is shipping cotton to this country.

Our competitors get cotton at 8½ cents a pound less than we do. A lot of it comes under Public Law 480. What we are attempting to do is to provide that the 10 percent shall not wreck the agreements which have been made.

Mr. MUNDT. As I said earlier, I can understand why the proponents of the legislation wish to insure success of the program, and I do not blame them. I point out that what the Senator of North Carolina has said demonstrates the great problem with which we are confronted in respect to the other agricultural areas.

From the standpoint of the dairymen and the poultry people, because of a succession of activities by Republican and Democratic administrations, I point out, the cotton textile industry already enjoys an advantage and a privilege which is not available to others, because the President, the Department of State, and the Department of Agriculture have gotten busy and have negotiated agreements multilaterally for the textile industry, which they have not done for the other farm industries. That is one difficulty.

Now the textile industry is asking the Congress to pyramid the privileges enjoyed by the textile industry, by saying, "In addition to that which we have enjoyed, the advantage of receiving this kind of service and getting a multilateral agreement, we now ask the Congress to pass a special bill"—that is, the bill before the Senate—"which will keep out the 10 percent of imports from those countries who are on the fringes, who did not sign the voluntary agreement."

As I have said, I can understand that desire, but it magnifies the problem. The textile industry is asking the Congress to pyramid its special privileges. The industry had one privilege, and it would like to have another. The cotton industry would tell the other sectors of

agriculture, "Sit out in the anteroom; we will get to you some time."

Other agricultural industries would like to have some consideration now. They do not want to stop the textile program. They are for it. I shall be for it. I hope my associates in this legislative effort will also vote for it. This is probably the only opportunity, however, the Senate will have to do something effective for other suffering segments of our agricultural and timber economy.

We who sponsor the amendment modified it, after listening to the arguments yesterday, in a desire to be helpful and in an effort to be compliant and conciliatory, in the hope that there would not be a "dog in the manger" position supported by the textile industry.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. I should like to inquire of the distinguished Senator from South Dakota if it is true that one of the great areas which is now being damaged, which has been damaged in the past 2 or 3 years, is the area which produces sheep and lambs, because of the importation of lambs from various other countries?

I well recall that more than 2 years ago the lamb and sheep people made an application to the Tariff Commission under the peril point clause of the tariff laws. They were totally unable to get any recognition of the fact that they were being irreparably damaged, that prices were being deflated. Those prices are reflected in today's lamb market and sheep market throughout the United States.

Those of us who come from that part of the country where sheep and lambs represent a critical part of the agricultural economy bear the brunt of being left out of agreements such as the one which has been negotiated in respect to cotton.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator from Colorado asked me a question, and I should like to answer.

The Senator is correct. As is well known to this body and to the Senators who serve on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I am sure, the situation in respect to the importation of wool got so bad that there was great damage to the textile industry. As the Senator from North Carolina pointed out, one of the great woolen mills folded up, and perhaps others have done the same.

The situation in respect to wool got so bad that, for many years before the situation became serious with respect to cotton, the wool people came to the Congress asking for the same kind of tariff protection consideration and the same kind of results which are now asked to be given to the cotton people. It was then said, "No, you can't exclude foreign wool imports, because we need them for peaceful negotiations with the other countries of the world and our

good-neighbor policy." Therefore, the Congress passed a special National Wool Act, so that the taxpayers now have to pay for the fact that there is not a protective tariff from the standpoint of protecting the wool industry.

The tariff protection was not provided for the wool industry; yet it is sought to be done for the cotton industry.

Tariff protection is not provided now with respect to the frozen carcasses which are coming in from New Zealand and from Australia, flooding the market and cutting down prices.

All we ask our good friends on the other side of this argument to do is to give us an opportunity now, when they are doing something good for cotton to include in the other suffering farm products. We ask them not to hurt us, but to help us while they are helping themselves.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. I observe on page 3 of the hearings held by the committee of the other body that the importation of cotton textiles in 1960 amounted to 6 percent of the consumption in the 50 States. We should consider what the percentage of imports is in the field inquired about by the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MUNDT. Wool?

Mr. HRUSKA. Lambs and mutton.

Mr. ALLOTT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HRUSKA. In 1959 imports of lamb and mutton from other countries were 14.4 percent of the total consumption. In 1960 imports were 11.5 percent, and in 1961 they were 12.1 percent. Those imports were approximately twice as much as the imports of cotton and cotton textiles.

Mr. ALLOTT. The Senator is entirely correct. I thank him for that information.

I should like to address another question to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota.

While the measure primarily affects agricultural products, I would feel remiss if I did not point out at this time that in the field of mining our country has been as derelict in protecting our industry. That has been demonstrated by the repeated attempts of the lead and zinc producers to obtain relief from the Tariff Commission under the peril point clause or the escape clause of the tariff laws. They have been repeatedly denied substantial relief in that area.

For example, today the combined price of lead and zinc in this country is approximately 20 cents. I have been looking for the present quotations, but I cannot find them. Lead and zinc cannot be produced in this country for less than 30 cents. Yet one lead and zinc industry in Colorado has been closed down and is a dead industry because of a failure to act. Nevertheless, we shall be asked at this session of Congress to act in the broad general area with relation to reciprocal trade negotiations. The Senator from Nebraska pointed out very well the other day in his remarks that the

present measure is the first step away from a piece of legislation that we have not even yet enacted, but which the President has requested. Does not the Senator agree that the question we are considering with reference to agricultural products will also recur again and again, particularly with respect to the mining industry?

Mr. MUNDT. Yes. Of course, we are talking about agricultural products and not the mining industry. We wonder if there is any validity to the blunt charge made by the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] that this committee textile protective proposal was a part of a tradeoff program. The senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] has charged that votes from the textile industry are being traded in support of the President's new tariff proposals in order to give a pyramiding of privilege and concession in return for promises that Senators will vote for the President's program on tariffs generally and take away from Congress for all time hereafter control over tariff legislation.

I do not know whether there is anything to that statement or not. It appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It was made by a highly reputable distinguished member of the majority party, the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], who is in "on the know" on a great many things. The truth of that charge will be documented or refuted in the voting record of the Senate when we read first the rollcall today and then the rollcall a few weeks or a few months from now, when the President's tariff proposal is before us. Anyone with a lead pencil and a pair of bifocal glasses, with the two CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS before him at that time will know whether the trade was made or not and who made it, because the fact will be recorded for all time to come. If such a trade was made, of course, the lead and zinc people will be hurt, as will many others.

Mr. JORDAN. If there has been any trading of votes, the word has not yet reached me. I have not heard anything about it.

Mr. MUNDT. I have merely repeated the accusation made by a Democratic colleague of the Senator. I was surprised to read it. I am deeply disappointed. I shall look at the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for verification or refutation when the votes on these proposals are eventually recorded.

Mr. JORDAN. I was surprised to hear that the statement was in the RECORD. I am surprised that the Senator made such a statement. As I said before, I am thoroughly in sympathy with what the Senator from South Dakota proposes. He and I have served on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. We have fought for those engaged in agriculture. We know of the needs of that industry. They need all the help they can get. The distinguished Senator from South Dakota and I know that while lamb was being imported into our country, the Government was also buying lamb and stockpiling it. I know that such action was wrong, and have said so.

Mr. MUNDT. The identical thing is being done now with respect to dairy

products. The Government is purchasing dairy products and stockpiling them.

Mr. JORDAN. I think it is perfectly silly. One of the first statements that I made on the floor of the Senate was with reference to textiles. I said that the Government should enter into a quota system, not only in respect to textiles, but also lead, zinc, copper, and every other commodity whose need is filled in this country. In my opinion, quotas are the only final remedy. The remedy is not tariffs. An equitable tariff cannot be established on any commodity today. For example, textile workers in Portugal receive about 9 or 10 cents an hour. That is their wage scale. Workers in Hong Kong receive even less than that amount. The wage in Japan is about 20 cents an hour, in England 60 cents, and in France and Belgium about 60 cents. We cannot establish a tariff that would be equitable everywhere. It would be impossible. The final remedy, in my opinion, should be the establishment of quotas on all the commodities needing them. More of those commodities cannot be brought into our country, for we cannot absorb them. Our industry cannot live under the pressure.

The proposal is a voluntary thing. I do not wish to hurt any industry named in the amendment. I think too much of the Senators who are interested, and know what they are trying to do. I am thoroughly in sympathy with what they are trying to do.

Mr. MUNDT. I agree with what the Senator has said with reference to handling imports by establishing higher tariffs. I recognize the validity of his argument that quotas work more effectively. As a friend of agriculture generally, I recognize that the Senator has worked with us on these problems. I do not quite buy the concept that we cannot keep out the cheap loin-cloth-produced competitive products with tariffs. If one would take a pencil and multiply fast enough, he would see that we could make the tariff high enough to do the job. We might have to get it up to a 200-percent tariff, a 500-percent tariff, or a thousand-percent tariff. As countries reduce the value of their currency by rigging it, we must increase tariffs. Of course, quotas would be an easier way to achieve the objective. I appreciate the expression of sympathy by the distinguished Senator, but there is the question of timing. We are confronted with the question whether we shall do something when we have the opportunity, or indefinitely delay action to an unknown time, which perhaps will never arrive.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I fully agree with the objective of the Senator from South Dakota, and commend him the action being taken.

It never made sense to me to import some commodity that we already had in great abundance in this country, particularly a commodity with respect to which there is a Government program to help an industry, a farmer, or some other segment of our economy. To pile up surpluses of the kind we have and

at the same time to import the same commodities never has made sense to me.

Four or five years ago when we passed the Soil Bank Act I thought the proposed program might be helpful in curtailing surpluses. I thought if we kept on importing farm products without limit, the program would do no good whatever. Senators will recall that I offered an amendment to the bill relating to the Soil Bank. The amendment was simple. It would limit the importation of any commodity in surplus to the average of the previous 3-year period. The amendment included also byproducts of any farm commodity such as cotton. The textile producers became interested in it. The amendment lost, but only by 1 or 2 votes.

Now we have an even worse problem in the Midwest. Lambs are a good example. The price has been ruined. Sheep producers have not been making money. Most of them are losing money. I believe the sheep population in the United States is at the lowest point in our history, even though there is a wool price support program. So the problem is very serious. I do not think it will ever be solved unless Congress itself solves it. I do not think we can depend on the Tariff Commission to do it for us, nor can we depend on delegating our authority to some other body that is more internationally minded than domestically minded.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for his contribution.

In conclusion, the facts are pretty clear. In the United States we are importing large quantities of farm products. We wrestle around the difficulties involved. Scandals have grown out of the maladministration of the Commodity Credit Corporation. Our get-rich-quick Wallingfords are operating in the Sol Estes case in Texas. That is a consequence of the fact that we have a serious surplus farm problem, which to a great extent, and possibly in total, we are importing from abroad, by bringing in competitive products while asking farmers in this country to reduce their production.

Now we have an opportunity to do something about the problem. We can at least try to establish some kind of protective mechanism against the importation of farm products instead of only the importation of cotton. That is the purpose of our proposal.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me before he yields the floor?

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 26 minutes remaining.

Mr. MUNDT. I am happy to yield, if the Senator obtains the necessary time from his side of the aisle.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. President, I am glad to yield to the Senator from Florida from the time available to me.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

Will the Senator indicate what efforts, if any, have been made in behalf of the livestock operators to have steps taken

similar to those that have been taken in the field of textiles?

Mr. MUNDT. I would be happy to relate them, but the Senator's 28 minutes would expire before I even had a chance to start. We have been dealing with this problem for a long time. It has been taken up with all the big organizations, such as the National Beef Association and the Sheep and Lamb Producers Association. They have been interceding over the years with every available authority, including the White House, especially on the importation of frozen carcasses. They are constantly being told that it is not a serious problem. But it is a very serious problem.

Mr. HOLLAND. So far as livestock is concerned, without any reference to lambs, about which I know very little—

Mr. MUNDT. Lambs are included in livestock.

Mr. HOLLAND. From the standpoint of the producers of beef, the president of the National Cattlemen's Association lives in my State. I brought him before the committee, of which the Senator from South Dakota is a member, and I presented the president of that association to the committee. He happens to be a long-time, intimate friend of mine. I had a long conversation with him while he was in the city. I have yet to hear the first word about any effort having been made by the producers of beef to set up an arrangement similar to that which has been set up with reference to textiles. I am willing to help in establishing such an arrangement. But I must say to the Senator from South Dakota that I know of no effort in even the slightest degree that has been made in that regard.

The proposal of the Senator from South Dakota, in effect, would nullify the only effort that has been made over a period of years, because it would not allow some relief to be given—and I think it would be real relief—to an industry which has felt the greatest impact from importations from sources where we ourselves have furnished the mills and have furnished the low-priced cotton, textiles of various classes have been poured back into this country.

Incidentally, the 6 percent does not indicate the critical nature of this problem in respect to certain classifications of textiles.

It seems to me that the Senator from South Dakota must recognize that the cattle raisers have made no effort at all in this field. In effect, they are holding up their brethren in the textile field and in the cotton field by the effort they are making. I hope the Senator will reconsider his situation.

Mr. MUNDT. First of all, the Senator from Florida must expand his definition of livestock a little, because I am talking about sheep, and he is talking about cattle. I have gone to the national associations with this problem. I did not do so currently, but over the past decades I have done so because they have suffered seriously. We have made great efforts in the past. The current effort with regard to livestock is being made primarily from the standpoint of the lamb industry.

I say to my good friend from Florida that lambs are included in the livestock definition. The Senator apparently feels that the livestock industry does not need relief because the cattlemen have not asked for it recently.

Mr. HOLLAND. I have been speaking about the producers of beef and beef products, which is stated in the Senator's amendment.

Mr. MUNDT. Yes.

Mr. HOLLAND. That is the group that I was talking about. He also refers to pork and pork products. I have yet to be approached for the first time on this question by any pork producers. I am not too well acquainted with the situation with respect to lambs, because lambs are not produced in our State. I have not been approached by anyone in the lamb industry, either. Of course, there would be very little occasion for them to approach me; they would no doubt approach Senators from the States that produce lambs.

Mr. MUNDT. If the Senator would like to be included among Senators who have been approached by representatives of the lamb industry, I shall be glad to introduce some of those people to the Senator.

Mr. HOLLAND. No one has worked harder for giving preferred status under the price-support program to the producers of sheep and lamb than has the Senator from Florida. No one has worked harder than the Senator from Florida in behalf of special tariff grants on tariffs collected on wool imported from abroad, to subsidize the production of sheep and products of that kind in that field.

I am just as willing to go all out in the matter before us now. I do not believe the Senator is on sound ground in insisting that this be done in the way it is proposed to be done. These people have worked for years to solve this problem. The Senator has supported this effort in committee. He was a member of my subcommittee. He did not oppose the granting of special funds to a Commission to investigate the textile industry; to the contrary, he supported it.

Mr. MUNDT. Precisely.

Mr. HOLLAND. Therefore I cannot understand the Senator's position now.

Mr. MUNDT. I never suspected that the result would be the exclusion of everything but cotton textiles. Even so, I will vote for the bill. While it may be a selfish step, it is a step in the right direction. I am afraid, though, that it will come back to plague us. We cannot do something like this for one segment of agriculture and not for the rest of the farming community. However, I will vote for it, because these producers of cotton and the textile mills are in trouble.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am very glad to hear the Senator say that he will support the bill. I hope he will vote for it after his amendment has been rejected, because his amendment would cut the very heart out of the effort that is being made in the bill to allow some force and effect to be given to certain agreements, one a temporary agreement, and the other a more permanent agreement for 5 years, which will begin to run in the fall. The

Senator's amendment would cut the very heart out of both agreements.

Mr. MUNDT. I fear the Senator is not reading the right amendment.

Mr. HRUSKA. The original amendment has been modified. Now, the amendment identified as "5-16-62-C" has some additional alternatives included in it. It originally provided that the textile agreement would not go into force and effect until agreements were effected with respect to other commodities. However, two other alternatives have been added; namely, in the event that the President makes a bona fide effort to negotiate similar agreements as to other commodities, and fails therein, or secondly if he finds that a commodity is not being imported in sufficient quantity to seriously affect domestic producers. It is not obstructive in any way, or punitive. It empowers the President, under section 204, where he gets this absolute power, to give as much consideration and solicitude to other sectors of agriculture as he does to cotton.

It is said that the other sectors of agriculture have not expended as many efforts as have the people in the cotton field. That is probably true. However, they cannot come here. That is not where the power resides. The power resides in the White House. Does that mean that when the President is vested with unrestricted power, which he possesses under section 204, or which he is seeking in the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, he has the right to say, "I now have this power. The only way I will exert it on behalf of any sector of American industry is to have interested parties build up a terrific reservoir of pressure of a political nature and have their Senators and Representatives knock at the door of the White House to present their petition. Then I will say, 'Yes; I will give that relief, because you have shown up here in sufficient numbers to get it. However, there is a little bill in the Senate and in the House for which I seek approval. I will use some of this power you have previously given me if you on your part will vote this way or that way on a legislative measure which I desire.'"

That was stated by the senior Senator from Illinois yesterday. If that is true I wonder if that is what we are facing if the proposed Trade Expansion Act of 1962 is to be passed. I do not conceive of section 204 as representing a situation in which we are called upon to go as supplicants to the White House and say, "Mr. President, there are X numbers of Senators and Representatives here; please give us relief," and have him close his eyes to the merits of the situation, of which he is fully aware through his Secretary of Agriculture.

Not a week goes by when the Secretary of Agriculture does not draw attention to the difficulties of American agriculture. One of the biggest obstacles to its prosperity and stability is the import picture. The President has been given unrestricted and unlimited power. Shall he use it in response to political pressures, or on the basis of merits of situations as he knows of them through his Secretary of Agriculture?

The purpose of the Mundt amendment is to call the attention of the President to a serious condition and ask him, "Will you not make the same amount of effort in the other fields that you did in the case of cotton?"

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am glad that these amendments have been offered to the Senator's amendment. I was conversant with that fact before the Senator raised the point. It does not seem to me that they meet the situation at all, because they would hold, for instance, that the agreement now in force could not be supplemented by quotas against certain nations until after some time had elapsed. Who would be the judge as to whether the President had exerted bona fide efforts to negotiate agreements with respect to certain commodities?

Mr. HRUSKA. The President.

Mr. HOLLAND. With respect to livestock, I have not heard the first word in connection with beef and beef products, and whether any effort has been made in that connection. The Senator from Florida, who represents, in part, a large beef-producing State, has not heard a word of that sort.

Mr. HRUSKA. Only 2 years ago the beef producers submitted two petitions to the Tariff Commission. They revised the first one and submitted another. Preliminary hearings were held, and out of hand they were turned down. Similarly the lamb and sheep industry went before the Commission. Testimony was presented under the peril-point clause. They, too, were rejected virtually out of hand on the ground of the impossibility of submitting proof under the peril-point clause which would be sufficient to carry their burden imposed by the Tariff Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from North Carolina inform the Chair whose time is being used now?

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, an agreement was made that the time consumed by the Senator from Florida would be charged to the time of the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. HOLLAND. My understanding was that I had been yielded time by the Senator from North Carolina. If that is not the case, I regret it.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, how much time remains to both sides?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina has 13 minutes remaining; the Senator from South Dakota has 26 minutes left.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield me 5 minutes?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, by way of preliminary summary, yesterday and today we were confronted with a curious spectacle on the floor of the Senate. A large number of liberal trade advocates, advocates of free trade, and trade expansion, have been contending for the passage of the most highly protectionist measure that has been before the Senate during my service in Congress. It out-McKinleys McKinley. McKinley was an old-fashioned soul. All he had to contend with was the question of high tariffs

to implement his efforts in the field of imports. Now we are considering the case of cotton imports. We find, first, that the Government subsidy being paid to exporters of cotton is 8½ cents a pound. Then we find that arrangement supplemented by an agreement among 19 nations, of which this country is 1, to limit imports, an international cartel in violation of the very essence of free trade and antitrust principles.

Now in H.R. 10788 we come to a further proposal, namely, to give the President more power, so that he can limit imports and even prohibit them from nonagreement countries.

Of course, H.R. 10788 is a far cry from free-trade doctrine—as far as a cry can be from that kind of doctrine—because it is based upon an international cartel which is very severe and restrictive indeed.

Section 204 gives the President the power to negotiate agreements such as the 19-nation agreement; there is no question about it. Whether that is wise or not is beside the point; the power was exercised.

As I have previously said, the objective of the Mundt amendment is to obtain from the President the same grace, the same compassion, and the same solicitude for other agricultural products as he extended to cotton and its related industries. The Mundt amendment is not an obstructive or punitive measure; it is a measure which gives the President three alternatives before the cotton textile agreement can be adopted. One alternative is that the President negotiate similar agreements, and in like manner, as to other commodities. Or if he makes a bona fide effort, an effort in good faith, to make such agreements, but fails, then he can proceed to execute the cotton textile agreement. Or if he makes a finding that the imports of such commodities as are named in the Mundt amendment do not seriously affect domestic producers, he may put the cotton textile agreement into force. Those alternatives are added for the purpose of giving the President some leeway and with that thought in mind.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, we are nearing the end of the time allotted under the voluntary agreement to terminate the debate at 2:30 o'clock. I believe there are one or two Senators on our side of the question, and perhaps Senators on the other side of the question, who are not aware of that. I suggest that there be a quorum call, the time for the quorum call to be charged to neither side. If that be agreeable, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, all debate is to be terminated at 2:30 o'clock.

Mr. MUNDT. That is correct. But the time for the quorum call would not be charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time for the quorum call would have to be divided equally.

Mr. MUNDT. That would be all right. We understand the reason for that.

Mr. JORDAN. Under the ruling of the Chair, the time for the quorum could consume all the remaining time.

Mr. MUNDT. I suggest a quorum call of 3 or 4 minutes, to give warning to Senators in their offices; then the quorum call could be discontinued.

Mr. JORDAN. How would the time for the quorum call be charged?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the vote will come at 2:30 o'clock; therefore, the time for a quorum call would be charged equally to both sides.

Mr. JORDAN. Does the Senator from South Dakota suggest that 2 minutes would be sufficient for a quorum call?

Mr. MUNDT. Yes.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. President, I would not object to a quorum call which would continue for 2 minutes and then be called off, the time for the quorum call to be charged equally to both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll. The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, how much of my 5 minutes remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

The point is made by some Senators that some sectors of agriculture other than the cotton industry have not made diligent effort to obtain the same kind of treatment which the cotton industry is now getting. This point should be viewed in the light of the fact that under section 204, under which this power was exercised by the President, no guidelines or procedures of any kind are prescribed. Unrestricted, unlimited power is granted to the President. Any power exercised under that section is exercised only according to the conscience of the President. Any request for exercise of his power thereunder must be addressed to him.

The purpose of the Mundt amendment is to bring to the attention of the President the fact that commodities other than cotton are in dire straits; that they need attention; and that the same efforts should be exerted in their behalf under section 204 as we have witnessed in respect to cotton.

It has been said several times that this measure is not a political football. On the score that it is not a partisan football, I suppose that statement is true, because the cotton industry and the textile industry have no regard for political or State lines. However, the only reason why cotton has received the preferred treatment it has received is that there has been joint political action. The distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] put it this way yesterday:

What we face in the Senate is that the textile group is a very powerful group, centered not only in New England and the Middle States, but also in the Southern States. In a very genteel fashion they have held a pistol at the head of the President

and said, "There will be no trade expansion bill unless you take care of cotton and wool." I suppose that is exactly what happened, and under that pressure the poor man could not hold out.

I do not know what the fact is in that regard, because what I have just read is not my language.

I sincerely hope that things like that did not happen and are not a fact.

But if Congress is to provide unrestricted Presidential power and if it is to be exercised only if political pressure from the Congress is brought to bear upon the President, and that only then will he exercise that power, and that then there will be a quid pro quo, then we shall be in a bad situation, indeed; because then the conscience of the Nation, as reposed in the President, will be exercised, not on the basis of merit, not on basis of the needs and the distress of the various segments of agriculture, but only in response to political pressure.

Again I raise this question: If the Senate passes the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, which contains provisions granting the President much power, and if thereafter there prevails the concept that such power will be used only in response to political pressures generated from the Congress, then the only advantage of such a bill will be that the log-rolling which heretofore has occurred on the floors of the Senate and House on an item-by-item tariff bill will be transferred from the Congress to the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue. I sincerely believe that would not be of benefit; in fact, it would be of great detriment to the national interest.

So I repeat that the Mundt amendment should be adopted, because it is not punitive, but helpful. It is an effort to call attention to this problem and to provide for three alternatives before the cotton-textile agreement will go into effect. Certainly the Mundt amendment should be adopted.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. President, I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the many difficulties with which our domestic textile industry is faced have been the subject of extensive study by the Special Textile Study Subcommittee of the Commerce Committee, of which I am a member. The other members of the subcommittee are the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] and the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON]. I may say that both Senator PASTORE and Senator COTTON, as members of the subcommittee, have rendered magnificent service to our country.

Our subcommittee has issued reports in 1959, in 1961, and again this year. It became evident to anyone who took the time to study our reports that the domestic textile situation was deteriorating rapidly, and that unless some definite remedial steps were taken, the domestic textile industry was in danger of virtual collapse.

I may say that the evidence adduced during the hearings conducted by the Special Textile Study Subcommittee showed that textiles rank second only to steel, as regards the national defense. So the textile industry is an essential one, not only from the standpoint of that segment of our economy, but also from the standpoint of the national defense and the very survival of our Nation.

The studies revealed that from the end of World War II through 1961, employment in the United States in the textile industry had decreased drastically. There was a loss of more than 268,430 jobs. More than 926 textile mills were forced to close their doors during the same period.

Definite recommendations were made by the Special Textile Subcommittee, but these were only partially implemented. The supplemental reports filed subsequent to the initial report of 1959 provide clear evidence that the situation is growing worse, rather than better, as time passes.

The long-term textile agreement which has been negotiated by the 19 participating nations in Geneva will, if signed, provide the tools which will make it possible to give relief to our domestic industry. The 19 nations participating there produce about 90 percent of the world's total textile manufactures. However, in order to insure the success of the agreement, it is necessary to control imports from nonparticipating nations. It is for that purpose that the pending bill is before us.

Mr. President, although I am in sympathy with the purpose of the Mundt amendment, as a practical matter it would nullify what was striven for in Geneva. Although it is readily apparent that some relief must be had in the areas covered by the Mundt amendment, certainly it would not be wise to penalize the textile industry by postponing the effective date of the Geneva agreement until such time as similar agreements in regard to the several areas mentioned in the amendment had been negotiated or begun with other countries. For that reason, Mr. President, I feel that I must vote against the Mundt amendment.

However, I wish to repeat that I am in sympathy with the principles embodied in the Mundt amendment; and I shall be pleased to cooperate with the able Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the able Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and other Senators in seeking to have protection provided under section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 for the segments of our economy which are covered by the Mundt amendment.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. THURMOND. I shall be happy to yield to the able Senator from New Hampshire, if the Senator from North Carolina will yield time for that purpose.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. President, I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from South Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. THURMOND. I thank the Senator from North Carolina; and now I yield with pleasure to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I shall not take long.

I wish to compliment the Senator from South Carolina on the very clear and forthright statement he has made.

It has been a great privilege to serve with him during the past few years on the Special Textile Subcommittee. I have admired the steadfastness and the singleness of purpose with which he has worked in behalf of the welfare of the textile industry. I am sure that anyone who knows him has full confidence in his assurance that he—like the Senator from New Hampshire—stands ready to cooperate with our friends in dealing with the problems they have; that there will be no idea of betraying their interests for the interests of the textile industry; but that simply because of the peculiarly desperate situation the textile industry is in, we are asking that this bill be passed without delay and without any mutilating amendments.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I wish to thank the able and distinguished Senator from New Hampshire for his kind words; and I desire to state that in discussing the bill and the Mundt amendment he has expressed my own sentiments exactly and he is eminently correct in the position he takes. I certainly desire to see relief granted for the other agricultural fields which are so badly in need of relief.

I want to say again that I do not know of any subcommittee that has worked harder or has been under more able leadership than the committee on which the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] have served or one that has accomplished more in bringing its reports to the attention of the Senate and the proper agencies.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President—

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I yield myself—

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes, I yield for that purpose.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I notice that an amendment has been offered since we entered into the unanimous-consent agreement last evening. Does that mean that all debate on all amendments must cease by 2:30 for the vote?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The agreement provides that debate on the Mundt amendment and all amendments thereto shall close at 2:30.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President—

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I did not hear all the Chair's response to the question from the Senator from Rhode Island. I direct the Chair's attention to the fact that the unanimous-con-

sent agreement also allocates 30 minutes to the Miller amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is to be after disposition of the Mundt amendment and all amendments thereto.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes.

May I ask the Chair how much time is left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. At this time there are 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. What is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is the question of agreeing to the so-called Humphrey-Morse substitute for the so-called Mundt amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Chair.

The first vote, therefore, will be on the substitute offered by the Senator from Oregon and myself last evening. The yeas and nays have not been ordered on that amendment. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, there are two fundamental differences between the Mundt amendment and the Humphrey substitute. First of all, the substitute provides that the negotiations that have already been had relating to textiles shall not be interfered with. The Mundt amendment, despite the additions of last evening, still does not so provide.

Second, the Humphrey substitute provides that after the negotiations on textiles have been completed, the "President shall negotiate agreements with representatives of foreign nations limiting in like manner the export of the United States from foreign countries to the following commodities: beef and beef products, pork and pork products, fresh and frozen lamb, poultry and poultry products, dairy products, timber and timber products."

But that amendment also provides what I consider to be a vital function of the executive branch, when it says that it shall be done "when in his judgment such imports seriously affect domestic producers."

It seems to me we have an obligation, in light of the negotiations that have taken place thus far at Geneva, to complete action on the textile matter. It also appears to me that, if there is evidence demonstrating that other commodities are threatened with serious injury due to imports, and if the President is so convinced, he should take action—

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator used the word "after" textile agreements have been completed. The words are "in addition to."

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is right. I do not want to get the Senate in the situation of interfering with what are important negotiations that have been undertaken and which are ready to be completed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield myself 1 additional minute.

Furthermore, if the Mundt amendment is adopted, the Senate can rest assured that the countries with whom we have been negotiating will feel this is a delaying tactic, and we are likely to lose everything we have gained thus far.

I do not think we need any amendment to this bill, but if evidence of injury can be shown to other commodities—which, by the way, are numerous, as they affect the State of Minnesota—then the President shall take action similar to that taken under the textile provision. I think the proposal is fair and legitimate and would protect the legitimate interests of all those products, and at the same time not play havoc with those interested in the textile industry.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator is saying that if conditions merit the President's attention to beef and beef products, dairy and dairy products, and timber and timber products, and so forth, because the condition seriously affects domestic producers, then the President shall consider for those products the same kind of multilateral agreements as he has considered in the case of textiles. Is that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct; without interfering with all that has been done on textiles. Any further delay on textile negotiations is likely to wreck the result of negotiations had thus far.

Mr. PASTORE. I do not see how any good, warmblooded American can be against the amendment.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. COTTON. The Senator's amendment mentions only the agreement with respect to cotton and cotton textiles. It seems to me that under the wording of the amendment, if it is adopted as a substitute, it will rule out completely the President's authority to negotiate agreements for wool and manmade fabrics in the textile field, because the bill as it now reads leaves the matter completely open. The Senator mentions beef and beef products, and so forth, but he does not say a word about textiles other than cotton textiles.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The purpose of my amendment was to replace the Mundt amendment. It does not affect any other part of the bill.

Mr. COTTON. It does not affect in any way textiles other than cotton textiles?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct, because the Mundt amendment relates to cotton and cotton textiles.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

What the Senator from Minnesota has just said is precisely what is worrying me. The echoes from his words are still reverberating through the Chamber, that the legislative purpose of the Hum-

phrey amendment is to replace the Mundt amendment. That is exactly what it would do, but it would replace it with nothing. It would replace it with a void. It would leave it in a vacuum. Let me read what is in section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956. The Humphrey amendment really restates what is in it. It has been basic law since 1956. It provides that the President is authorized to negotiate with representatives of foreign governments in an effort to obtain agreements limiting the export from such countries and the importation into the United States of any agricultural commodity or product manufactured therefrom, including textile and textile products.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, in my time?

Mr. MUNDT. We cannot assume that some President would be stupid enough to negotiate for some product or industry that was not in trouble.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does the Senator say there is no difference between the words "authorize to negotiate" and the words "shall negotiate"? Will the Senator give me the benefit of his legal opinion?

Mr. MUNDT. It reminds me of the old curse of Sisyphus, whose task was to roll a huge stone up to the top of a hill. As the stone constantly rolled back, his work was incessant. All the Humphrey amendment does is to provide the curse of Sisyphus with jet propelled motion that makes it move up and down fast enough to break the sound barrier. It runs up the hill and down again. All the authority is taken away when it is provided, as an out for the President "when in his judgment such imports seriously affect domestic producers." Those words can be found in section 204.

I should like to ask the Senator from Minnesota if he is willing to modify his amendment, to make it more effective. I cannot change it. I wish to make an amendment to it, but it would be in the third degree. Would the Senator be willing to strike out everything after the word "products" on line 10?

Mr. HUMPHREY. May I say to my colleague, it is too late in the consideration of the proposal to make that kind of patchwork addition to my amendment which the Senator made to his amendment last night.

Mr. MUNDT. It is not too late.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The amendment is before the Senate. The Senate can vote on the amendment. It will give the Senator from South Dakota an opportunity to vote for it.

Mr. MUNDT. Am I correct in the assumption that the Senator from Minnesota has used the long way around to say "no"?

Mr. HUMPHREY. And on the Senator's time, may I say.

Mr. MUNDT. Is the answer in the negative or in the affirmative?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is this still on the Senator's time?

Mr. MUNDT. It is on my time. I hope the Senator will answer in monosyllables.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I was trying to say to the Senator that it is too late for the type of patchwork additions added last evening to the Mundt amendment, which I thought did little to help the amendment and might only do something to injure it. I do not wish to have the architects and the carpenters of the Mundt amendment patch up my amendment.

The answer is "No."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mrs. NEUBERGER in the chair). The time of the Senator from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. MUNDT. Madam President, in approximately one-half a minute I wish to point out that at the appropriate time, when no Senator will have been shut off from debate, I shall move to lay on the table the Humphrey substitute, because it would do nothing, and would do nothing the long way around, much like the manner in which I got an answer to the question which I asked, calling for a "yes" or "no" answer.

Madam President, I now yield a minute to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. AIKEN. Madam President, without doubting the sincerity of the Senator from Minnesota or of the Senator from Oregon, and with an appreciation of the needs of the textile industry for some further protection, regardless of whether the Mundt-Hruska amendment should be agreed to or not, I must say that after reading the Humphrey amendment I find it would give to the dairy people, to the livestock people, and to the timber people of this country absolutely no protection which they do not have at the present time, because it relates to judgment. I quote three words from the Humphrey amendment, "in his judgment." It says that the President, "in his judgment," must find that imports seriously affect domestic producers.

In the judgment of the President the livestock people, the dairy people, and the timber people do not need any further protection, or the President would have taken the same steps to protect them that he has taken to protect the textile industry. Therefore, the Humphrey amendment is completely meaningless except as a means of shunting aside an amendment which would mean something, whether one is in favor of it or not.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Which Senator yields time now?

Mr. HUMPHREY. How much time remains, Madam President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority has 2 minutes, and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, I should like to have the Senator from South Dakota demonstrate some further eloquence in respect to the measure, since he has such an abundance of time.

Mr. MUNDT. Madam President, I am perfectly willing to comply with the

request of my good friend the Senator from Minnesota, unless there is some other Senator on my side who would like to speak.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, would the Senator be willing to yield for a quorum call, each side reserving 1 minute to summarize, and to yield back the remainder of the time?

Mr. MUNDT. Madam President, so that all Senators can hear, the request is with respect to a willingness to yield back the time, conserving a minute for a concluding argument on each side.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Or 2 minutes.

Mr. MUNDT. If no Senator wishes to talk, there is no reason why we should repeat the same arguments over and over again. I am willing to do that, unless some Senator on either side of the argument wishes to speak.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Shall we yield back all the remaining time? That is agreeable to me.

Mr. MUNDT. I should like to explain for at least a minute the reason why I think the Senator's amendment should be tabled.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Let us reserve 1 minute on each side, or perhaps 2 minutes.

Mr. MILLER. Madam President, will the Senator yield 1 minute to me?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. For the purpose of obtaining a clarification in respect to the bill, may I ask the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] or the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] whether there is any intention, in respect to the proposed legislation, that what the Senate is doing today is inconsistent with the Trade Agreements Act or with the trade development assistance bill which is now pending in the Congress?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Iowa spoke to me privately about this, very considerably. I think there is nothing in the pending bill or in the amendment, at least, which would be in conflict with the other measures. I speak for myself.

Mr. PASTORE. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. For my part, I can best answer the question of the Senator by asking him a question. What in the proposal would contravene the Reciprocal Trade Act?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minute which has been yielded has expired.

Mr. MUNDT. Madam President, what is the time situation now?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota has four minutes remaining.

Mr. MUNDT. I yield a half minute to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. I thank the Senator from South Dakota.

In answer to the Senator's question, I wish to say that the Senator from Iowa does not know of anything which would to him appear to contravene the other provisions. As I pointed out to the Sen-

ator with respect to the Miller amendment, which is on the desk and which will receive consideration following action on the pending amendment, I think the Senate should make it absolutely clear that there is not to be anything which would contravene those provisions. In other words, if there is to be an interpretation of the proposal by lawyers some time in the future, I think it would be helpful for those lawyers to know that the three acts are to be construed exactly alike.

Mr. PASTORE. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. This is absolutely a voluntary arrangement entered into by the countries which are signatory to the agreement. For that reason, there can be no contravention on the part of this proposal with respect to the laws of any sovereign government. What is being done is being done by unanimous consent.

There is nothing more than an agreement which has been entered into by 19 countries. What we are attempting to do is to implement that agreement. There is nothing which is inconsistent with our reciprocal trade policy or fair trade policy.

Mr. COTTON. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield a half minute to the Senator from New Hampshire.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Two minutes remain of the time of the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. COTTON. Madam President, I wish to make it clear that I am in favor of the bill in its present form. I am against the Mundt-Hruska amendment. I shall also vote against the substitute amendment of the Senator from Minnesota and of the Senator from Oregon.

I should like to see the bill pass as it stands, in the form in which it came from the House. I do not wish to make it necessary for the bill to go to a conference.

The bill has a single clear purpose of taking care of the textile situation. I want to help defeat the Mundt amendment, and I want to do it in a frontal assault and not by some circuitous tactic which will clutter up the bill and send it to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time yielded to the Senator from New Hampshire has expired.

Mr. PASTORE. Madam President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield a minute to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. I feel much like the Senator from New Hampshire feels, but I am a realist. I am a practical man. I want something to be done by the Congress which will be of value. I fear that if we do not accept the substitute amendment we shall not succeed.

I am practical enough to know that many Senators on both sides of the aisle have felt the political impact involved in respect to the Mundt amendment and, for various reasons, do not wish to be placed in the position of turning their backs on the economic plight of pro-

ducers in their own States. I recognize that, as I said before. That is the reason why I shall support the amendment.

I shall support the substitute amendment for the simple reason that many Senators in this Chamber feel we are forced to recognize publicly the fact that the meat producers of this country are in trouble.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota has 1 minute remaining. The Senator from South Dakota has 2 minutes remaining.

What is the will of the Senate?

Mr. MUNDT. Madam President, I shall consume my 2 minutes, and the opposition can consume its 1 minute.

I now yield 1 minute to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, 30 years ago the predominant word I encountered in farm terminology was the word "parity." Parity means equality. In my book parity is not limited to equality, what the farmer is paid as distinguished from prices he must pay for what he buys. Parity should include parity of treatment as well in the whole farm and trade domain.

It occurs to me that what the distinguished Senator from South Dakota is asking is a parity of treatment for other commodities as well as for cotton and cotton textiles. For that reason I hope the Senate will see fit to vote down the Humphrey proposal and to support the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota and other Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, I think the argument can be summarized as follows: If Senators wish to pass a textile bill, which I should like to do, they should vote for the Humphrey substitute amendment. The Humphrey substitute amendment in no way would interfere with the proposed legislation.

For the benefit of those Senators who are deeply concerned about other commodities, referred to in the Humphrey substitute amendment, that substitute amendment would direct the President, when there is a serious injury to those domestic producers, to take action similar to that which was taken in respect to textiles. This merely means negotiations, the attempt to arrive at an agreement. As the Senator from Rhode Island said, it is a voluntary thing. I believe the substitute amendment would not injure the purposes of the bill, and would do them good.

Mr. MUNDT. Madam President, how much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. One-half minute.

Mr. MUNDT. Madam President, since the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] has refused to strike from his proposed substitute the language, "When in his judgment such imports seriously affect domestic producers", the amendment means nothing and it adds

nothing. As I said earlier, it is merely a robber-baron device to destroy the opportunity of the Senate to vote the Mundt amendment up or down. That amendment encompasses all agricultural products. I sincerely hope that the Humphrey-Morse substitute amendment will be rejected so that we may have a vote on a meaningful amendment. We should vote my amendment up or down and then vote on final passage of the bill.

Madam President, I move that the Humphrey-Morse substitute amendment be tabled, and on my motion I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from South Dakota to table the Humphrey-Morse substitute for the Mundt amendment, as modified.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Madam President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. What is the question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion to table the Humphrey-Morse substitute for the Mundt amendment, as modified. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] are absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL] is paired with the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado would vote "nay," and the Senator from Arizona would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent on official business.

On his vote, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] is paired with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL]. If present and voting, the Senator from Arizona would vote "yea," and the Senator from Colorado would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 23, nays 63, as follows:

[No. 53 Leg.]

YEAS—23

| | | |
|---------------|--------------|----------------|
| Aiken | Dirksen | Murphy |
| Allott | Dworschak | Pearson |
| Bennett | Fong | Prouty |
| Boggs | Hickenlooper | Smith, Maine |
| Carlson | Hruska | Tower |
| Case, S. Dak. | Kuchel | Williams, Del. |
| Cotton | Miller | Young, N. Dak. |
| Curtis | Mundt | |

NAYS—63

| | | |
|--------------|--------------|----------------|
| Anderson | Hill | Moss |
| Bartlett | Holland | Muskie |
| Beall | Humphrey | Neuberger |
| Bible | Jackson | Pastore |
| Burdick | Javits | Pell |
| Bush | Jordan | Proxmire |
| Byrd, Va. | Keating | Randolph |
| Byrd, W. Va. | Kefauver | Robertson |
| Cannon | Kerr | Russell |
| Case, N.J. | Lausche | Saltonstall |
| Clark | Long, Mo. | Scott |
| Cooper | Long, Hawaii | Smith, Mass. |
| Dodd | Long, La. | Sparkman |
| Douglas | Magnuson | Stennis |
| Engle | Mansfield | Symington |
| Gore | McCarthy | Talmadge |
| Gruening | McClellan | Thurmond |
| Hart | McGee | Wiley |
| Hartke | McNamara | Williams, N.J. |
| Hayden | Metcalf | Yarborough |
| Hickey | Morton | Young, Ohio |

NOT VOTING—14

| | | |
|----------|-----------|----------|
| Butler | Eastland | Johnston |
| Capehart | Ellender | Monroney |
| Carroll | Ervin | Morse |
| Chavez | Fulbright | Smathers |
| Church | Goldwater | |

So Mr. MUNDT's motion to table the Humphrey-Morse substitute for the Mundt amendment, as modified, was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] for himself and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], in the nature of a substitute for the so-called Mundt amendment, as modified.

The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Madam President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. What is the question before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the so-called Humphrey amendment, in the nature of a substitute for the so-called Mundt amendment, as modified.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GORE (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. If he were present and voting he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], and the Senator from

Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] are absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL] is paired with the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado would vote "yea" and the Senator from Arizona would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] is paired with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL]. If present and voting, the Senator from Arizona would vote "nay," and the Senator from Colorado would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 62, nays 23, as follows:

[No. 54 Leg.]

YEAS—62

| | | |
|--------------|--------------|----------------|
| Anderson | Holland | Muskie |
| Bartlett | Humphrey | Neuberger |
| Beall | Jackson | Pastore |
| Bible | Javits | Pell |
| Burdick | Jordan | Proxmire |
| Bush | Keating | Randolph |
| Byrd, Va. | Kefauver | Robertson |
| Byrd, W. Va. | Kerr | Russell |
| Cannon | Lausche | Saltonstall |
| Case, N.J. | Long, Mo. | Scott |
| Clark | Long, Hawaii | Smith, Mass. |
| Cooper | Long, La. | Sparkman |
| Dodd | Magnuson | Stennis |
| Douglas | Mansfield | Symington |
| Engle | McCarthy | Talmadge |
| Gruening | McClellan | Thurmond |
| Hart | McGee | Wiley |
| Hartke | McNamara | Williams, N.J. |
| Hayden | Metcalf | Yarborough |
| Hickey | Morton | Young, Ohio |
| Hill | Moss | |

NAYS—23

| | | |
|---------------|--------------|----------------|
| Alken | Dirksen | Murphy |
| Allott | Dworshak | Pearson |
| Bennett | Fong | Prouty |
| Boggs | Hickenlooper | Smith, Maine |
| Carlson | Hruska | Tower |
| Case, S. Dak. | Kuchel | Williams, Del. |
| Cotton | Miller | Young, N. Dak. |
| Curtis | Mundt | |

NOT VOTING—15

| | | |
|----------|-----------|----------|
| Butler | Eastland | Gore |
| Capehart | Ellender | Johnston |
| Carroll | Ervin | Monroney |
| Chavez | Fulbright | Morse |
| Church | Goldwater | Smathers |

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PASTORE. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the Mundt amendment, as amended.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota will state it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In other words, the scheduled yea-and-nay vote now would be upon the same item as that on which the Senate has just voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It has been suggested that unanimous consent be asked to vacate the order of the yeas and nays on the Mundt amendment, as amended. However, some Senators have indicated that they wish to register an objection both to the Mundt and the Humphrey amendments.

I make the request that the order for the yeas and nays be vacated, but in the full knowledge that there are Senators who will wish to vote against the proposal as it is now before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. MORTON. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota will state it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Do I correctly understand that the Senate is now about to vote on the exact text of the amendment as previously voted upon?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is the same language.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Madam President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota will state it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That does not necessarily mean, does it, that the issue is the same? The question previously voted upon was one of preference; whether the Senate wished to substitute the language of the Humphrey amendment for the language of the Mundt-Hruska amendment. Now, that decision having been made, the question is whether the Senate desires the Mundt amendment, as amended, or nothing. Is not that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from

New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] are absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL] is paired with the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado would vote "yea" and the Senator from Arizona would vote "nay."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] is paired with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL]. If present and voting, the Senator from Arizona would vote "nay," and the Senator from Colorado would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 62, nays 24, as follows:

[No. 55 Leg.]

YEAS—62

| | | |
|---------------|--------------|----------------|
| Anderson | Hill | Neuberger |
| Bartlett | Holland | Pastore |
| Beall | Humphrey | Pell |
| Bible | Jackson | Proxmire |
| Boggs | Jordan | Randolph |
| Burdick | Kefauver | Robertson |
| Bush | Kerr | Russell |
| Byrd, Va. | Kuchel | Saltonstall |
| Byrd, W. Va. | Lausche | Scott |
| Cannon | Long, Mo. | Smith, Mass. |
| Case, S. Dak. | Long, Hawaii | Sparkman |
| Clark | Long, La. | Stennis |
| Dodd | Magnuson | Symington |
| Douglas | Mansfield | Talmadge |
| Engle | McCarthy | Thurmond |
| Gore | McClellan | Wiley |
| Gruening | McGee | Williams, N.J. |
| Hart | McNamara | Yarborough |
| Hartke | Metcalf | Young, N. Dak. |
| Hayden | Moss | Young, Ohio |
| Hickey | Muskie | |

NAYS—24

| | | |
|------------|--------------|----------------|
| Aiken | Dirksen | Morton |
| Allott | Dworshak | Mundt |
| Bennett | Fong | Murphy |
| Carlson | Hickenlooper | Pearson |
| Case, N.J. | Hruska | Prouty |
| Cooper | Javits | Smith, Maine |
| Cotton | Keating | Tower |
| Curtis | Miller | Williams, Del. |

NOT VOTING—14

| | | |
|----------|-----------|----------|
| Butler | Eastland | Johnston |
| Capehart | Ellender | Monroney |
| Carroll | Ervin | Morse |
| Chavez | Fulbright | Smathers |
| Church | Goldwater | |

So the amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, I move that the vote by which the amendment, as amended, was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. PASTORE. Madam President, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, what part of the unanimous-consent agreements applies at this time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the agreements, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] is entitled to submit his amendment, if he wishes to do so, under a 30-minute limitation.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Before that is done, Madam President, I should like to yield 1 minute to myself, in order that I may yield to the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. MUSKIE. Madam President, I should like to ask the Senator from Minnesota a question.

Section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 applies to "any agricultural commodity or product manufactured therefrom."

I wish to ask the Senator from Minnesota whether it is the intent of his amendment to give the same relief which is provided in his amendment to the products and commodities which are spelled out in section 204, in the language I have just now read.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, I reply to the Senator from Maine by stating that the amendment which has been adopted is an amendment to section 204—the difference being that in this amendment the word used is "shall," whereas in the remainder of section 204 the word used is "authorized." I hope that will be interpreted in such a way that where injury is done to a domestic producer, the President will enter into these multilateral negotiations.

Mr. MUSKIE. I express the hope that if there is any doubt of it in the legislation, it will be corrected in the conference on the bill.

Mr. MILLER. Madam President—
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HOLLAND. Madam President, if the Senator will yield, I notice that the time on this item, and final passage of the bill, is to be under the control of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. I am told, since I am the ranking member present, that I should substitute for the Senator from Louisiana, which I shall be glad to do, or turn that responsibility over to the acting majority leader [Mr. HUMPHREY].

Mr. HUMPHREY. I hope the Senator from Florida will take control. I should like to have lunch.

Mr. MILLER. Madam President, I yield myself 5 minutes. I do not be-

lieve that much time need be spent on the Miller amendment. However, in view of the action of the Senate in adopting the last amendment by the Senator from Minnesota, it is necessary to perfect my amendment.

I ask the clerk to read my amendment as modified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa, as modified, will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Add the following at the end of the bill: "Action taken under this Act shall be consistent with all other Trade Agreement Acts and all agreements negotiated thereunder."

Mr. MILLER. Madam President, I asked the question yesterday, at the time we were debating the main bill, whether or not there was any intention that there be any inconsistency of action under this bill or under section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 as against other trade agreement acts, and particularly as against the Trade Development Assistance Act of 1962, which is now pending before the Congress. I received a reply last evening that we did not know. Then today I believe that the senior Senator from Minnesota replied that there was no intention that there be any inconsistency.

Let me say that I understand so far the only trade agreements that have been negotiated under section 204 are those relating to textiles, but this bill goes far beyond textiles; it relates to all agricultural commodities, as does section 204.

I want to make sure, and it seems to me every Member of the Senate would want to make sure, that what we are doing today will result in no danger in the future of our being inconsistent in our trade agreement acts. We are giving the President a great amount of discretion under the bill. He has a great amount of discretion under section 204. He will have a great amount of discretion under any trade agreement act. We must have consistency in our foreign trade policy. All this amendment does is make it very clear that any action taken under this bill will be consistent with our trade agreement acts.

I shall be very happy to yield for questions.

Mr. PASTORE. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. I have been reading the Senator's amendment. I agree we must not do anything that would be inconsistent with the trade agreement acts, because, after all, when we make agreements with foreign nations, we in the United States pride ourselves on never breaking the agreements. I am beginning to wonder what far-reaching impact the amendment may have. If the Senator will tell us what he has in mind, we will be in a better position to answer the question. My own feeling is that we are legislating on the floor of the Senate on a broad subject. We are using words the full consequence of which we cannot know. Let me read the language proposed to be added to the bill: "Action taken under this act shall be consistent with all other trade agreement acts."

Will the Senator elucidate as to what he fears included in the measure would be inconsistent with the trade agreement acts and all other agreements negotiated thereunder? What does that mean?

We may be in the position of putting words in the bill, the possible far-reaching consequences of which, even the author does not know. I say with all respect to the Senator.

Mr. MILLER. I appreciate that question. I want to make it very clear that the Senator from Iowa does not know what far-reaching ramifications there may be, but the Senator from Iowa knows one thing, that we ought to be consistent in our foreign trade policy, and whether we have one or two or five acts, we ought to be consistent. This is particularly so when we are giving so much discretion to the President. I have no particular objection to any President having discretion to negotiate during an agreement, but when we have a bill which states that if a multilateral agreement has been or shall be concluded under authority of this section among countries accounting for a significant part of world trade, I do not know what "significant part of world trade" means. It is up to the President to determine that. When he makes the determination, I want to be sure that determination is going to be consistent with a similar determination made under any other Trade Agreement Act.

Mr. PASTORE. Will the Senator yield for a suggestion?

Mr. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. I am merely thinking out loud. I am confronted with this situation suddenly, without having had time to study it. Would the Senator agree to a modification such as this: "Action taken under this act shall be consistent with our trade agreement acts policy"?

It does not mean a great deal. I will subscribe to that. But, if I understand correctly, the Senator wants to make sure that, in what we are acting on today, we shall do nothing that will reflect upon or be in contravention of our trade agreement acts. The Senator admits—and I admire him for saying so—that at the moment he cannot see all the repercussions that might flow from this amendment. If I were on the conference, I would agree to take it to conference and see what agreement we could reach on it. But I am not on the conference. Personally, I would not want to oppose it or vote for it. I think I should tell the Senator that I shall move to table the amendment, not because it is a reflection on the amendment or the Senator, but because it is too nebulous for us to vote on it at this time.

Mr. MILLER. Will the Senator be good enough to repeat the modification he suggested a moment ago?

Mr. PASTORE. My suggestion was: "Action taken under this act shall be consistent with our trade agreement acts policy."

Mr. MILLER. With all other trade agreement acts policy?

Mr. PASTORE. I am taking the words of the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. Is the word "act" singular or plural?

Mr. PASTORE. It is plural in the amendment. That is the way I use it. If the Senator wants the amendment to go to conference and see what they will do about it, that is satisfactory with me; but that is up to the committee. I do not think we ought to be doing anything that is inconsistent with the foreign policy of our country, whether it relates to trade or any other policy.

Mr. MILLER. I appreciate the consideration of the Senator from Rhode Island. I have no premium on draftsmanship in this matter. The Senator has been responsive to my concern when we talk about possible inconsistency in our policy. I will accept the modification of my amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. Madam President—The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa has the floor.

Mr. HOLLAND. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLER. I shall be happy to yield. May I say I will accept the modification. If we can have some agreement on it, we can dispose of it without having to bother with a rollcall.

Mr. PASTORE. I want to say at this time that this is just contemporaneous thinking on my part, and I realize that the bill will have to go to conference, because it has been amended. I would not object in any way if the conference saw fit to consider the amendment. I do not have any pride of authorship in the modification. I merely suggested it.

Mr. HOLLAND. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Acting for the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], who will be the chairman of the conference, I am willing to take this amendment, with the suggestion of the Senator from Rhode Island, with this view—that I think what we are all trying to do if we take that action is to provide that actions taken under the particular measure which we are voting on today shall not be taken if they will contravene our trade agreement policy.

In conference, if we find there is some "bug" in respect to it, we would feel free to omit it. If we find the idea could be perfected by better language, we would feel free to change the language. I think we should take it to conference in that form, and I am willing to do so.

Mr. MILLER. I thank the Senator for his statement. With that understanding, Madam President, I move the adoption of my amendment. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield back all remaining time against the amendment. It is my understanding that we are agreed upon the adoption of the amendment for the purpose of taking it to conference in the restated form suggested by the Senator from Rhode Island. Is that correct?

Mr. MILLER. That is the understanding of the Senator from Iowa.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amend-

ment of the Senator from Iowa, as modified.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. PASTORE. Madam President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, line 11, it is proposed to strike out "article" and to insert "articles."

Mr. PASTORE. Madam President, this is merely a grammatical correction. The bill of the Senate had the plural "articles." The bill of the House had the singular form "article." This is merely a grammatical correction. I do not think there should be a dispute. I ask that the amendment be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Rhode Island.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. COTTON. Madam President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. COTTON. Have the yeas and nays been ordered on the question of passage of the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have not been ordered.

Mr. COTTON. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the question of passage of the bill.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, because the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] is absent from the Chamber and wishes to speak on the bill.

Mr. COOPER. Madam President, will the Senator yield first?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I withdraw my suggestion, Madam President.

Mr. COOPER. A parliamentary inquiry, Madam President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. COOPER. Has the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa been voted on as it was modified?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Iowa, as modified, has been agreed to.

Mr. COOPER. Before a vote is taken on the bill I should like to ask some questions of the sponsor of the bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. Madam President, after the quorum call, when the Senator from South Dakota is present, since I shall control the time in favor of the bill I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. I defer my questions until after the quorum call.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Madam President, on the time of the Senator from South Dakota, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call may be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HOLLAND. Madam President, all time has elapsed unless the bill has been read the third time. May I ask the Presiding Officer whether the bill has been read the third time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill has not been read the third time. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 10788) was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

Mr. MUNDT. Madam President, we have 15 minutes on each side in which to debate the proposed legislation. I do not expect to consume very much of my time. After I have concluded my remarks I shall be happy to yield to other Senators, or to yield back the remainder of the time. I wish to summarize the situation as I see it.

First, I express my appreciation for the many manifestations of sympathy and pledges of support given to us by supporters of the proposed legislation, who rejected our effort to do something effective for other branches of agriculture today by adding an amendment to the textile protective tariff bill. We got no helpful action. We got a great array of adjectives, and I hope that some day we can cash in on these good intentions.

I should be more optimistic about the situation in that regard were it not for a famous statement by Elbert Hubbard at one time, that the hot place way down under is at the end of a road paved by good intentions.

I am sorry that we did not succeed in getting concurrent action. I voted against the Humphrey amendment because, as I said in the debate, it would add positively nothing to the power already existing. It would not grant the President any additional authority. It might be construed by some, who continue to resist efforts to help other branches of agriculture, as a convenient excuse for doing nothing.

I think we should not accept that kind of adjectival statement in lieu of action which is so desperately needed.

As I said on the floor also, I shall vote for the bill on the question of passage. I shall do so for two reasons.

I shall do so because the textile industry and cotton producers of this country are in serious straits, though perhaps no worse than those of the timber people, of the dairy people, or of other segments of the farm economy. At least they have succeeded, through machinations yet to be disclosed and yet to be confirmed, in getting favored treatment for a favored few.

Second, this group needs the help, and certainly I shall not vote to resist that help merely because other groups were not able to get similar help in other areas.

Like many in this Chamber, I was curious as to where the senior Senator from Illinois got his documentation for the fact that what we are witnessing today is a trade of tariff concessions for future votes on tariff legislation. I hope that is not true, yet I respect the senior Senator from Illinois enough to believe that he would not merely fabricate the charge. All we can do is to study the call of the roll record when it is made to determine the result on Mr. Kennedy's demand that Congress delegate to him all future tariff regulating authority.

It seems to me that those who are vitally interested in the protective tariff system as it applies to cotton must come to recognize that the same protective mantle has a part to play when it comes to lambs, when it comes to poultry products, and when it comes to other agricultural products as well as to timber and timber products.

It may have a part to play when it comes to manufactured products in other areas as well. I recognize that we must constantly revise our tariff policies. We must live in a competitive world and engage in international exchange. But I do not think we can long continue as the great Nation that we are, or that we can enduringly continue the job of shoring up the finances of 80 foreign countries, if we adopt tariff policies designed to pauperize great segments of our own economy.

It is well that the cotton segment of our economy is receiving privileged relief today. But I regret that the same reasoning has not been applied to other segments of agriculture which are suffering similarly. There is no hope for us under the Humphrey amendment, because it does not change the situation. It is a gesture in futility. But there is hope for us in the expressions of sympathy, concern, compassion, and cooperation made by so many Senators on the floor of the Senate during the course of the debate. I hope the result may be support which will make it possible to pass some kind of effective legislation that will protect the "Little Orphan Annies" on the farm who have been left out of consideration in this bill today.

Mr. COOPER. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. Madam President, I shall be glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Kentucky, but in order that his question may be answered, I have sent for the Senator in charge of the bill. He will be in the Chamber in a few minutes. If time is to be taken on the other side, or even on this side, I would rather yield for that purpose, reserving the time I agreed to yield to the Senator from Kentucky until that Senator arrives.

Mr. COOPER. Madam President, if the Senator will yield, I should like to ask my question, for perhaps some member of the committee can answer it.

Mr. HOLLAND. Madam President, I yield to the Senator from Kentucky. I ask him how much time he desires.

Mr. COOPER. Four minutes.

Mr. HOLLAND. Madam President, I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. My concern about the bill goes to the question of the policy it expresses. As it came before the Senate, the bill was limited to textiles and textile products, by its reference to multilateral agreements concluded under section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956. It would have the effect of authorizing the President to limit the importation of cotton textiles from the countries which are not partners to the agreement.

The Senator from Minnesota offered an amendment, which has been agreed to, which would direct the President to negotiate—the words used in the amendment are "the President shall negotiate." The amendment directs the President to negotiate agreements with other nations respecting a broad range of agricultural products, including timber and timber products.

My question goes only to the matter of policy. The President of the United States has sent to the Congress a trade message. He has asked the Congress to authorize him to reduce tariffs on all classes of items, rather than specific items, by 50 percent, and to reduce beyond 50 percent tariffs on those items in which the United States and the Common Market countries account for 80 percent of world exports. He asked us to authorize him to reduce all tariffs. Of course, the principle applies also to textiles and textile products, on which the agreement to limit exports to the United States has been negotiated. I would like to know whether this bill is consistent with the President's proposal. It seems to me that it is not, particularly since the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota has been agreed to.

Mr. MUSKIE. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Maine as much time as he desires.

Mr. MUSKIE. Madam President, I am not sure that I can personally answer the distinguished Senator from Kentucky.

First, the President has not proposed a free trade policy. We have not had free trade in this country from the outset. The tariff bill was either the first or second piece of legislation enacted by the First Congress of the United States in 1789. Ever since that time, as a part of our trade policy, we have had some form of adjustment provision. International trade inevitably involves adjustment.

Sometimes the adjustment is made in the private sector of our economy. Sometimes it is made by virtue of Government policy. The President's Trade Expansion Act itself contains provisions for the purpose of enabling import-impaired industries to adjust to the objective of trade expansion. So I think it is consistent with the objective of trade expansion to provide for trade adjustment policies in certain areas which public policy justifies.

Section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 states:

The President may, whenever he determines such action appropriate, negotiate

with representatives of foreign governments in an effort to obtain agreements limiting the export from such countries.

The Humphrey amendment would emphasize or reemphasize that language in current law. The language of the Humphrey amendment, which is quite clear, would direct the President to undertake to negotiate such agreements "when in his judgment such imports seriously affect domestic producers."

I point out to the Senator from Kentucky that negotiation requires and implies agreement by the other countries involved as well as ourselves. The Humphrey amendment would not authorize unilateral action. Section 204 itself does not authorize unilateral action.

Mr. COOPER. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. I shall be brief. The Humphrey amendment is pretty weak. It provides that the President shall take action when "such imports seriously affect domestic producers." I cannot get away from my belief that, despite the Senator's historical argument, on the one hand, the President is asking the Congress to give him freedom and authority, and on the other hand, the Congress is now attempting to restrict and limit that authority. We would direct him to take that action. I would not raise the question with respect to the textile industry because agreements for that industry have been negotiated with, but not yet signed by 19 countries, I do say that the amendment adopted represents a conflict of policy.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Has the Senator from Kentucky given consideration to the question whether the factual exemption that has been given to rugs, carpets, and rolled glass comes within the principle that he has implied in his question?

Mr. COOPER. I am asking questions. I know that all kinds of exceptions are being made. I view that as another exception.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If we should give special exemption to textiles, rugs, carpets and glass, upon whom would fall the burden of the proposed general reduction in tariffs? If we grant an exemption to some, will we not necessarily have to place a greater burden on those who will not be exempt? That is the question that has been bothering me about the three specific exemptions that have been granted thus far.

Mr. PASTORE. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island as much time as he desires.

Mr. PASTORE. To understand what we are attempting to do, we must go into the historical background of the events that have transpired which have brought us to our present position.

First, to appreciate what we are attempting to do, I invite the attention of Senators to the resolution introduced by

my good friend the Senator from New Hampshire in 1958, which called upon Congress to make an investigation of the decline in the textile industry.

We proceeded to investigate. On February 4, 1959, we made 11 specific recommendations to the President after conducting exhaustive hearings not only in Washington but in localities of the country which were interested in textile production. Among the recommendations that we made, we strongly recommended to the President that he institute mandatory quotas against the importation of certain textile products. The President rejected that recommendation. I suppose he rejected it because he thought that instituting mandatory quotas would be inconsistent with our trade policy as a whole. We had never done a thing like that before, except in the case of certain agricultural products, and for the obvious reason that we have large surpluses in America. That point is understood throughout the world.

Insofar as other products are concerned, we had never instituted mandatory quotas. Therefore, the President suggested that possibly it might be a solution of this problem if we called together all the nations of the world in conference, those nations that were exporting or producing textiles. That is what we did. These nations all sat around the table in Geneva in the early part of 1961 and negotiated this temporary agreement.

We must realize that there cannot be any inconsistency in this policy, because we are doing it with the consent and the acquiescence and the approbation of the countries involved.

The only thing that confuses this picture is that, after we entered into this agreement with all the countries which at that time we thought were in the textile business, two or three other countries have now gone into that business.

Our whole international trade policy has concerned itself with tariff walls; it has never concerned itself with quotas. These are voluntary quotas.

The dilemma in which we find ourselves is that the agreement we have achieved, which has now developed into a 5-year agreement beginning with October 28 of 1962, actually places us in the position where our friends have agreed not to export to this country in excess of a certain amount. That is with their consent. It is a reciprocal arrangement. For that reason we have this situation which is consented to by all the countries.

In the meantime, Egypt and one or two other countries are beginning to export in large quantities. That fact vitiates the effect of this whole agreement.

Under present law the President of the United States cannot move in where bilateral agreements are in existence. At the time the law was passed no multilateral agreements were contemplated. That creates more or less an ambiguity or a hiatus in the law. In order to cure that situation, the Commerce Department felt that the President would need this authority in order to more or less limit the loophole so as to make this agreement effective.

Mr. COOPER. I understand perfectly the situation with respect to the textile agreement. That was negotiated under the authority of section 204. The President can do that. My question goes to the Humphrey amendment. We have changed section 204, as I understand it, and we are now telling the President that he must negotiate with respect to agricultural products.

Mr. PASTORE. I believe this is being misunderstood. I am one of those who are willing to admit that we have done nothing here. We have merely recodified existing law. We picked out meat products, and we have said to the President, "You can do with relation to this what you have already done for the textile industry."

We are giving him authority which he already has. There is nothing more than that involved. If it were any different, I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. JAVITS. Madam President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield such further time as the Senator from Rhode Island may need.

Mr. JAVITS. Does section 204 cover the products referred to in the Humphrey amendment?

Mr. PASTORE. Yes; every one of them, and it goes beyond that. What we have said is that the President can do what he already has the right to do.

Mr. JAVITS. I hope these questions will clarify the situation. The words that trouble me are those which refer to "seriously or adversely affects."

Mr. HOLLAND. "Seriously affect domestic producers."

Mr. JAVITS. Yes.

Mr. HOLLAND. In the President's judgment.

Mr. JAVITS. Yes. Does that in any way materially change the criterion set forth in section 204?

Mr. PASTORE. No. All that the President can do is not shut anything off when he finds it seriously injures anyone. All he can do is negotiate with the countries on a multilateral agreement, in like manner as he did with respect to the cotton textile industry. He can invite these people to sit down to negotiate.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator does not feel that it materially expands or changes the basic authority contained in section 204. Is that correct?

Mr. PASTORE. If we had not done it, the situation would be the same.

Mr. MORTON. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. If I have any time remaining, I am glad to yield time to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. CURTIS. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Kentucky, on behalf of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], who is not in the Chamber at the moment.

Mr. MORTON. I wish to thank the Senator from Rhode Island for bringing this matter into focus. What disturbed me about the amendment was the reaction that it might have with some of our friends, our needed friends, around the world. What would they think in Auckland or Sydney about this

amendment? That is what disturbed me. I believe the Senator has straightened this out by showing that we have not really given the President any authority that he does not have already under existing law, and that this does not mean that we will set up quotas on foreign agricultural products.

Mr. PASTORE. If anything happened that concerned Australia or Argentina, all the President could do would be to call in the representatives of those countries, together with our representatives, and see if they could work out an agreement which would be acceptable to both sides, if there is a serious injury to a domestic industry. We have called upon the President, in fact, to invite these people to sit down to see if we can work out an agreement.

Mr. MORTON. That is under section 204?

Mr. PASTORE. It could have been done anyway.

Mr. MORTON. Under section 204?

Mr. PASTORE. Yes. That is why we did it in the textile industry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time of the Senator from Florida has expired.

Mr. HOLLAND. Has the time of the Senator from South Dakota expired?

Mr. CURTIS. If there are no further requests, I am directed by the Senator from South Dakota to yield back the remaining time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Nine minutes remain of the time allotted to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CURTIS. I yield back the remaining time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time for debate has been yielded back or has expired. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. KEFAUVER (after having voted in the affirmative). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] are absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Sena-

tor from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 80, nays 3, as follows:

[No. 56 Leg.]

YEAS—80

| | | |
|---------------|--------------|----------------|
| Aiken | Hickenlooper | Muskie |
| Allott | Hickey | Neuberger |
| Anderson | Hill | Pastore |
| Bartlett | Holland | Pearson |
| Beall | Hruska | Pell |
| Bennett | Humphrey | Prouty |
| Bible | Jackson | Proxmire |
| Boggs | Javits | Randolph |
| Burdick | Jordan | Robertson |
| Bush | Keating | Russell |
| Byrd, Va. | Kerr | Saltonstall |
| Byrd, W. Va. | Kuchel | Scott |
| Cannon | Lausche | Smith, Mass. |
| Carlson | Long, Mo. | Smith, Maine |
| Case, N.J. | Long, Hawaii | Sparkman |
| Case, S. Dak. | Long, La. | Stennis |
| Clark | Magnuson | Symington |
| Cotton | Mansfield | Talmadge |
| Curtis | McCarthy | Thurmond |
| Dirksen | McClellan | Tower |
| Dodd | McNamara | Wiley |
| Dworshak | Metcalf | Williams, N.J. |
| Engle | Miller | Williams, Del. |
| Fong | Morton | Yarborough |
| Gruening | Moss | Young, N. Dak. |
| Hart | Mundt | Young, Ohio |
| Hartke | Murphy | |

NAYS—3

| | | |
|--------|---------|------|
| Cooper | Douglas | Gore |
|--------|---------|------|

NOT VOTING—17

| | | |
|----------|-----------|----------|
| Butler | Ellender | Kefauver |
| Capehart | Ervin | McGee |
| Carroll | Fulbright | Monroney |
| Chavez | Goldwater | Morse |
| Church | Hayden | Smathers |
| Eastland | Johnston | |

So the bill (H.R. 10788) was passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the corresponding Senate bill, S. 3006, will be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. METCALF in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference thereon with the House of Representatives, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. TALMADGE, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, and Mr. MUNDT the conferees on the part of the Senate.

THE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the next order of business is the call of the calendar, which the clerk will proceed to call.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2801) to amend section 510 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to extend for 2 years the time during which a certain definition of the term "obsolete vessel" shall be used, was announced as first in order.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, by request, I ask that Calendar No. 1284, Senate bill 2801, be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard, and the bill will be passed over.

The next measure on the calendar will be stated.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I also ask, by request, that Calendar No. 1285, Senate bill 2829, amending title 12 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as regards war risk insurance; and Calendar No. 1286, Senate bill 2800, amending the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as regards the differential subsidy, be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection being heard, these bills will be passed over.

REPEAL OF SUBMISSION OF REPORT TO CONGRESS CONCERNING ELIGIBLE PUBLIC BUILDING PROJECTS

The bill (H.R. 7477) to repeal section 409 of the Public Buildings Act of 1949, requiring the submission of a report to the Congress concerning eligible public building projects was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 819) to provide for suitable works of art in Federal buildings was announced as next in order.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, by request, I ask that the bill be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection being heard, the bill will be passed over.

ACCEPTANCE BY PERSONNEL OF U.S. GOVERNMENT OF DECORATIONS, PRESENTS, AND DONATIONS BY CERTAIN COUNTRIES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2919) to authorize certain retired personnel of the U.S. Government to accept and wear decorations, presents, and other things tendered them by certain countries, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with amendments, at the designated places, to insert the following:

a. On page 40 insert the following additional medal for Admiral Arleigh A. Burke:

| | | | | |
|--|--|------------|---|----------------------------|
| | | "Germany." | Distin- guished Service Cross with Star. | Token of good will." |
|--|--|------------|---|----------------------------|

b. On page 41 insert the following additional medal for Vice Admiral Howard E. Orem:

| | | | | |
|--|--|------------|--|----------------------------|
| | | "Germany." | Grand Merit Cross with Star. | Token of good will." |
|--|--|------------|--|----------------------------|

c. On page 42, immediately below "Shaw, James C. 77130", insert:

| | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------|-----------|---|-------------------------------|
| "Peltier, Eugene, J. 77434. | Feb. 1, 1962. | Brazil... | Order of Naval Merit (Com- mander). | Token of good will." |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------|-----------|---|-------------------------------|

d. On page 43, immediately below "McElroy, John H. 62661", insert:

| | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|------------------|---------------|---|----------------------------|
| "Wiesner, Frederick C. 62979. | Oct. 1, 1957. | Ger- many. | Distin- guished Service Cross. | Token of good will." |
|-------------------------------------|------------------|---------------|---|----------------------------|

e. On page 43, immediately below "Ribble, George B., Jr. 70671", insert:

| | | | | |
|----------------------------------|--------------------|-----------|--|----------------------------|
| "Archer, Stephen M. 71396. | Mar. 1, 1962 | Greece... | Royal Order of George I (Com- mo- dore). | Token of good will." |
|----------------------------------|--------------------|-----------|--|----------------------------|

f. On page 44, immediately below "Gerber, Marvin L. 113084", insert:

| | | | | |
|------------------------------------|---------------------|-----------|---|----------------------------|
| "Whichard, Rogers D. 117575. | Nov. 1, 1961. | France... | Academic Palms Medal (Aca- demic Officer). | Token of good will." |
|------------------------------------|---------------------|-----------|---|----------------------------|

g. On page 44, immediately below "Baczinski Frank J. 77368", insert:

| | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------|----------|--|----------------------------|
| "Kelley, George A., Jr., 77431. | June 1, 1955 | Peru.... | Peruvian Cross of Naval Merit (Knight Com- mander) Dis- tintivo Blanco. | Token of good will." |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------|----------|--|----------------------------|

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF
BUDGET AND FINANCE

(For information only;
should not be quoted
or cited)

Issued June 1, 1932
For actions of May 31, 1932
87th-2d, No. 87

CONTENTS

| | | | | | |
|----------------------|--------|-------------------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------|
| Adjournment..... | 14 | Federal aid..... | 4 | Property..... | 21 |
| Bonds..... | 8 | Feed grain..... | 22 | Public works..... | 2 |
| Buildings..... | 9 | Foreign trade..... | 3 | Recreation..... | 21 |
| Census..... | 23 | Forestry..... | 10, 18, 21, 24 | Research..... | 25 |
| Civil defense..... | 7 | Grain storage..... | 15 | School lunch..... | 1, 13 |
| Cotton..... | 12 | Information..... | 20, 25 | Soil conservation.... | 11, 19 |
| Disaster relief..... | 5 | Legislative program.... | 13 | Taxation..... | 13 |
| Education..... | 4 | Marketing..... | 17 | Territories..... | 5 |
| Electrification..... | 16 | Mining..... | 10 | Textiles..... | 3, 12 |
| Export control..... | 3 | Payment-in-kind..... | 22 | Watersheds..... | 22 |
| Farm program..... | 15, 22 | Personnel..... | 6, 24 | Wheat..... | 22 |

HIGHLIGHTS: House began debate on school lunch fund apportionment bill.

HOUSE

1. SCHOOL LUNCH. Began debate on H. R. 11665, to revise the formula for apportioning cash assistance funds among the States under the National School Lunch Act. For a summary of the bill see Digest 81. pp. 8829-38
2. PUBLIC WORKS. The Public Works Committee was granted until midnight Sat., June 2, to file a report on H. R. 10113, to establish an Office of Public Works Coordination and Acceleration and to authorize the preparation of a plan for acceleration of public works when necessary to avoid serious nationwide unemployment levels. p. 8829
3. FOREIGN TRADE. Conferees were appointed on H. R. 10788, to amend section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 so as to authorize the President to regulate imports of textiles and textile products from nonparticipating countries of multi-lateral trade agreements. Senate conferees have already been appointed. p. 8828
The Select Committee on Export Control issued a report pertaining to an investigation and study of the Export Control Act of 1949 (H. Rept. 1753). pp. 8860-1
4. EDUCATION. The Education and Labor Committee reported without amendment H. R. 11888, to improve the quality of elementary and secondary education (H. Rept.

- 1752), with amendments H. R. 11340, to assist the States in further developing their programs of general university extension education (H. Rept. 1750), and with amendments H. R. 10056, to amend Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, relating to construction and maintenance and operation of public schools in federally impacted areas, to deny payments to school districts which are not in compliance with constitutional requirements that public schools be operated on a racially nondiscriminatory basis (H. Rept. 1751). p. 8860
5. DISASTER RELIEF; TERRITORIES. The Public Works Committee reported without amendment S. 1742, to authorize Federal assistance to Guam, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands in major disasters (H. Rept. 1747). p. 8860
6. PERSONNEL. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee reported without amendment H. R. 11753, to provide for the payment of certain amounts and restoration of employment benefits to certain Government officers and employees improperly deprived thereof (H. Rept. 1748). p. 8860
7. CIVIL DEFENSE. The Government Operations Committee issued a report on the national fallout shelter program (H. Rept. 1754). p. 8861
8. BONDS. Received from Treasury a proposed bill "to increase temporarily the amount of obligations, issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, which may be outstanding at any one time"; to Ways and Means Committee. p. 8860
9. BUILDINGS. Received from the President a report to the President by the ad hoc Committee on Federal Office Space. p. 8860
10. FORESTRY; MINING. Received from GAO a report on the review of the Administration by the Forest Service of mining claims located on national forest lands reserved from the public domain. p. 8860
11. SOIL CONSERVATION. Rep. Clem Miller discussed Soil Stewardship Week, saying, "We are proud of the men and women of the soil conservation movement for the example they present to our country and to the world's emerging nations of successful cooperative endeavor -- public and private; local, State and Federal." pp. 8841-2
12. COTTON. Rep. Alexander discussed the problems of the domestic textile industry and said, "it is ridiculous to force domestic textile producers to pay more for the same raw product than foreign producers pay. This is unfair competition of the rankest order." p. 8847
13. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Rep. Albert announced that the Consent Calendar will be called on Mon., June 4, and debate will continue on H. R. 11665, to revise the school lunch formula, on Tues. Also, H. R. 11879, the proposed Tax Rate Extension Act of 1962, will be considered next Tues. p. 8838
14. ADJOURNED until Mon., June 4. p. 8860

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

15. FARM PROGRAM. Rep. Schwengel urged a bipartisan investigation of the USDA grain storage program as a result of the Estes case, stated that if "this can happen with Billie Sol Estes, it can happen in the Department of Agriculture's dealings with hundreds of others," and inserted an editorial supporting his position. pp. A3979



United States
of America

Please return to
Division of Legislative Reporting
Office of Budget and Finance

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 87th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 108

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MAY 31, 1962

No. 87

Senate

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Friday, June 1, 1962, at 12 o'clock meridian.

House of Representatives

THURSDAY, MAY 31, 1962

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.
The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:
Psalms 112: 6: *The righteous shall be held in everlasting remembrance.*

Almighty God, we thank Thee for the significant and abiding meaning of Memorial Day when we were privileged to call to mind with gratitude and affection those who lived and labored with us for a little while upon this earth and are now dwelling forever with Thee in the sanctuary of Thy presence and peace.

We humbly acknowledge that there are times of indescribable loneliness when we are filled with deep longings for the touch of "vanished hands and the sound of voices that are silent."

Wilt Thou keep our hearts aglow with blessed memories and kindle within us the glad assurance that on some bright and glorious day we shall be with them in hallowed union for "life is lord of death and love can never lose its own."

Hear us in the name of our risen Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Monday, May 28, 1962, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

- H.R. 1395. An act for the relief of Sydney Gruson;
- H.R. 1404. An act for the relief of Mrs. Frances Mangiaracina;
- H.R. 1712. An act for the relief of Elizabeth Rose DiCarlo;
- H.R. 2103. An act for the relief of Antonio C. Ysrael;

H.R. 2672. An act for the relief of Sonia Maria Smith;

H.R. 2839. An act for the relief of Mildred Love Hayley;

H.R. 4783. An act to grant constructive service to members of the Coast Guard Women's Reserve for the period from July 25, 1947, to November 1, 1949;

H.R. 8368. An act for the relief of A. Eugene Congress;

H.R. 8570. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit disbursing officers of an armed force to entrust funds to other officers of an armed force;

H.R. 9466. An act for the relief of Sfc. Jesse O. Smith; and

H.R. 11261. An act to authorize an adequate White House Police force, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1653. An act for the relief of William Falby.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1264. An act for the relief of Capt. Dale Frazier;

S. 1849. An act for the relief of Stephen S. Chang;

S. 2107. An act to amend title 14, United States Code, entitled "Coast Guard," to extend the application of certain laws relating to the military services of the Coast Guard for purposes of uniformity;

S. 2208. An act for the relief of Su-Fen Chen;

S. 2661. An act for the relief of John Joseph (also known as Hanna Georges Youssef);

S. 2667. An act for the relief of Sebastiana Santoro;

S. 2668. An act for the relief of Francisina Jorge Querido, Jose Jorge Querido, Luis Jorge Querido, Elizia Jorge Querido, and Izabel Jorge Querido;

S. 2694. An act for the relief of Mrs. Jum Ak Marek;

S. 2722. An act for the relief of Miss Livia Sernini (Cucciatti);

S. 2729. An act for the relief of Hom Wah Yook (also known as Hom Bok Heung);

S. 2751. An act for the relief of Susan Gudera, Heinz Hugo Gudera, and Catherine Gudera;

S. 2760. An act for the relief of Yuk-Kan Cheuk;

S. 2766. An act for the relief of Mrs. Tom Pon Shee (also known as Tom Pon Ma Cheung);

S. 2777. An act for the relief of Arild Ericksen Sandli;

S. 2803. An act for the relief of Juliano Barboza Amado and Manuel Socorro Barboza Amado;

S. 2804. An act for the relief of Sheu Chwan Shaiou;

S. 2865. An act for the relief of Ferdinand A. Hermens;

S. 2876. An act to extend the authority to insure mortgages under sections 809 and 810 of the National Housing Act, and to extend the coverage of section 810 to include persons employed at or in connection with an installation of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration or the Atomic Energy Commission;

S. 2965. An act to provide standby authority to accelerate public works programs of the Federal Government and State and local public bodies;

S. 3016. An act to amend the act of March 2, 1929, and the act of August 27, 1935, relating to loadlines for oceangoing and coastwise vessels, to establish liability for surveys, to increase penalties, to permit deeper loading in coastwise trade, and for other purposes;

S. 3266. An act to amend section 2 of the act entitled "An act to create a Library of Congress Trust Fund Board, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1925, as amended (2 U.S.C. 158), relating to deposits with the Treasurer of the United States of gifts and bequests to the Library of Congress and to raise the statutory limitation provided for in that section; and

S. 3327. An act to make certain federally impacted areas eligible for assistance under the public facility loan program.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 107. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Navajo Indian irrigation project and the initial stage of the San Juan-Chama project as participating projects of the Colorado River storage project, and for other purposes;

S. 971. An act for the relief of Salvatore Briganti; and

S. 3157. An act to repeal subsection (a) of section 8 of the Public Buildings Act of 1959, limiting the area in the District of Columbia within which sites for public buildings may be acquired.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., May 31, 1962.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: I am transmitting herewith a sealed envelope received from the White House said to contain a message from the President concerning an atomic agreement with Belgium.

Very truly yours,
RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives.

BELGIAN ATOMIC COOPERATION AGREEMENT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy with accompanying papers.

To the Congress of the United States:

This Government has recently signed with the Government of Belgium an atomic cooperation agreement for mutual defense purposes. This agreement, which has been concluded pursuant to sections 91-c and 144-b of the Atomic Energy Act, is essentially the same as agreements we have concluded since 1959 with a number of other NATO countries. By providing for the exchange of information and nonnuclear materials the agreement with Belgium will enable us to cooperate in developing plans and training personnel so that Belgian NATO forces can effectively contribute with other NATO countries to the collective defense effort. The members of NATO have made clear that it is necessary for their common defense to maintain the most modern NATO forces, and that these forces must be capable of using nuclear weapons if necessary. Since it is well known that measures to build NATO military strength are designed solely for defense purposes, these measures should not be a cause of concern to other countries.

In general, NATO countries are proceeding simultaneously along two lines to provide for their necessary military

strength; conventional forces are being strengthened, and an effective nuclear capability is being maintained. The conclusion of this agreement is consistent with these current policies and with the continuing alliance purposes of collective defense.

I am forwarding a copy of the atomic cooperation agreement with Belgium to each House of the Congress, in accordance with the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended. I am also forwarding a letter from the Secretary of State transmitting an authoritative text of the agreement, a copy of the joint communication by the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission recommending my approval of the agreement and a copy of the memorandum recording my affirmative response to their recommendation.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.
THE WHITE HOUSE, May 29, 1962.

ADOLF M. BAILER

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 1347) for the relief of Adolf M. Bailer, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: That the Attorney General is authorized and directed to discontinue any deportation proceedings and to cancel any outstanding order and warrant of deportation, warrant of arrest, and bond, which may have been issued in the case of Adolf M. Bailer. From and after the date of enactment of this Act, the said Adolf M. Bailer shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and order have issued.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

KEVORK TOROIAN

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 5652) for the relief of Kevork Toroian, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Line 5, strike out "October 22, 1959" and insert "November 23, 1959".

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN ALIENS SERVING IN U.S. ARMED FORCES

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 638) for the relief of certain aliens who are serving in the U.S. Armed Forces, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments as follows:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "Orlando V. Jamandre,".

Page 1, line 7, strike out "Federico M. Periquet,".

Page 2, line 4, strike out "thirteen" and insert "eleven".

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INDUSTRIAL SECURITY PROGRAM

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (H.R. 11363) having to do with the industrial security program be recommitted to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

SECTION 204 OF AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 10788) to amend section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. COOLEY, POAGE, GATHINGS, HOEVEN, and MCINTIRE.

CORNERSTONE OF RAYBURN HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING

(Mr. ALBERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute).

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to advise Members that the copper box that is to be permanently sealed into the cornerstone of the Rayburn House Office Building will be placed in the Speaker's Lobby today, Thursday, May 31, and again on Monday, June 4, 1962, and that on both of those days Members of the House of Representatives may deposit in the box any message, signature, or other writing which they wish to have preserved for poster-

June 7, 1963

Elder Dam and irrigation project, Kans., in view of the farm surplus situation. pp. 9169-71

Sen. Allott inserted a resolution from R. J. Moses favoring the proposed Kryingpan-Arkansas project, Colo. p. 9222

5. FOREIGN TRADE. Sen. Long, Mo., inserted a statement by economics professors favoring the President's trade agreements bill. p. 9173

Sen. Allott spoke in favor of moving cautiously on the President's trade bill and inserted letters he has received on this subject. pp. 9222-3

6. CONSERVATION. Sen. Long, Mo., inserted and discussed an editorial on the importance of conservation to Mo. pp. 9173-4

7. PERSONNEL; EXPENDITURES. Received the report of the Joint (Byrd) Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures for April. pp. 9158-61

8. ASSISTANT SECRETARY. Received from the State Department a proposed bill to authorize an additional Assistant Secretary of State; to Foreign Relations Committee. p. 9157

9. FOOD DISTRIBUTION. Received a GAO report on the food distribution program in D.C.; to Government Operations Committee. p. 9157

10. ELECTRIFICATION. Sen. Hruska criticized S. 3153, stating that it would give the Pacific Northwest priority for electric power that should also be available to Nebraska. pp. 9223-5

11. RESEARCH. Sen. Hruska inserted his speech at the field day for the Fort Robinson, Nebr., Beef Cattle Research Station. pp. 9225-7

12. ROADS. Sen. Chavez summarized the history of construction of the Inter-American Highway. pp. 9227-8

13. SOIL STEWARDSHIP. Sen. Humphrey spoke in commemoration of Soil Stewardship Week. pp. 9174-5

14. ATOMIC ENERGY. Sen. Gore explained and inserted correspondence regarding proposed amendments to the agreements between the U. S. and the European Atomic Energy Community. pp. 9175-8

15. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Sen. Mansfield announced that the Interior appropriation bill is to be debated Mon. p. 9227

HOUSE

16. FARM PROGRAM. The Rules Committee reported a resolution for the consideration of H. R. 11222, the proposed Food and Agriculture Act of 1962. pp. 9231, 9258

Rep. Findley discussed the farm bill and criticized "the broad scope of Federal spending this bill would launch for recreation facilities, both publicly and privately owned, and the unanswered question of racial segregation in these facilities." pp. 9249-50

17. FOREIGN TRADE; TEXTILES. The "Daily Digest" states that "Conferees, in executive session, agreed to file a conference report on the differences between the Senate- and House-passed versions of H. R. 10788, to regulate imports of agricultural commodities." p. D477

18. FOREIGN AID. The Foreign Affairs Committee reported without amendment H. R. 11921, the proposed Foreign Assistance Act of 1962 (H. Rept. 1788). p. 9258
19. PERSONNEL. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee reported with amendment H. R. 11523, to authorize the employment without compensation from the Government of readers for blind Government employees (H. Rept. 1787). p. 9258
The Rules Committee reported a resolution for the consideration of H. R. 11677, to prohibit discrimination on account of sex in the payment of wages by certain employers engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce and to provide for the restitution of wages lost by employees by reason of such discrimination. pp. 9231, 9258
20. PUBLIC DEBT. The Ways and Means Committee reported without amendment H. R. 11990, to provide for a temporary increase in the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act (H. Rept. 1789). p. 9258
21. HEALTH. The interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) with amendments H. R. 10541, to assist States and communities to carry out intensive vaccination programs. p. D446
22. CIVIL DEFENSE. Received from GAO a report on the review of policies and procedures established by the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, succeeded by the Office of Emergency Planning, for the use of excess stockpiled materials by Federal agencies. p. 9258
23. ADJOURNED until Mon., June 11. p. 9258

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

24. FOREIGN TRADE. Extension of remarks of Rep. Gross inserting an article, "Small Businessmen Oppose Free Trade." p. A4187
25. RECLAMATION. Extension of remarks of Sen. Young, N. D., inserting a resolution urging early approval of the Garrison diversion unit, N. D. p. A4203
26. TEXTILES. Extension of remarks of Rep. Taylor discussing the problems of the domestic textile industry, saying, "We must face the fact that the textile import problem is still with us and further action is needed." pp. A4218-9

BILLS INTRODUCED

27. FARM LABOR. S. 3382, by Sen. Williams, N. J. (for himself and others), to amend the Public Health Service Act so as to establish a program to assist in the construction of adequate sanitation facilities for migratory farm labor; to Labor and Public Welfare Committee. Remarks of Sen. Williams. pp. 9162-3
28. FARM LOANS. S. 3387, by Sen. Humphrey (for himself and Sen. McCarthy), to amend the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 in order to increase the limitation on the amount of loans which may be insured under subtitle A of such Act; to Banking and Currency Committee.
29. FOOD AND FIBER. S. J. Res. 197, by Sen. Humphrey, to authorize and request the President to appoint a bipartisan Commission to make a study of the total food and fiber requirements of the United States; to Agriculture and Forestry Committee. Remarks of author. p. 9165

* Prior to the executive session the subcommittee held a hearing on H.R. 11015, to provide for public notice of settlements in patent interferences; and H.R. 11588, to provide authority to protect heads of foreign states and other designated officials. Heard testimony from David L. Ladd, Commissioner of Patents (H.R. 11015); Government witnesses (H.R. 11588 and 11015); and a public witness (H.R. 11015).

BANKRUPTCY ACT

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee No. 4 held a hearing on H.R. 9191, to amend the Bankruptcy Act relating to priority of debts in the form of wages and commissions. Heard testimony from Representative Bennett of Florida; Edwin L. Covey, Chief of Bankruptcy, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts; and a public witness.

MERCHANT MARINE ACT—SHIP CONSTRUCTION

Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries: Met in executive session and ordered reported favorably to the House the following bills:

H.R. 10022, to amend section 510(a)(1), Merchant Marine Act, 1936; and

H.R. 11586, to continue the 55-percent limit on construction-differential subsidy for construction, reconstruction, and reconditioning of ships for 3 additional years.

The committee passed over H.R. 11587, to provide for the reimbursement of certain vessel construction expenses.

In an open hearing heard testimony from public witnesses on H.R. 11126, to authorize admittance of the vessel *City of New Orleans* to American registry, and permit use of such vessel in coastwise trade.

FEDERAL PAY RAISE—BLIND

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service: The committee, in executive session, ordered reported favorably to the House H.R. 11523, to authorize the employment without compensation from the Government of readers for blind Government employees.

Prior to the executive session held a hearing on Federal pay increase legislation, and heard testimony from public witnesses.

COMMUNIST ACTIVITIES

Committee on Un-American Activities: Concluded hearings on Communist conspiratorial techniques and propaganda used in implementing Communist Party directives within the U.S., and the structure, objectives, and activities of the Communist Party in the Cleveland, Ohio, area. Heard testimony from public witnesses.

RENEGOTIATION ACT

Committee on Ways and Means: Met in executive session on extension of the Renegotiation Act. No announcements were made.

Joint Committee Meetings

RADIATION STANDARDS

Joint Committee on Atomic Energy: Subcommittee on Research, Development, and Radiation concluded its current series of hearings on radiation standards, including fallout, after receiving testimony from Dr. Lauriston Taylor, Chief, Radiation Division, National Bureau of Standards, who also represented the National Committee for Radiation Protection; Dr. Forrest Western, Director, Office of Radiation Standards, AEC; Dr. Donald Chadwick, Chief, Division of Radiological Health, Public Health Service; Dr. Russell Morgan, department of radiology, Johns Hopkins University; Boisfeuillet Jones, representing the Federal Radiation Council; and Alexander Grendon, Coordinator of Atomic Energy Development and Radiation Protection, Sacramento. Subcommittee also heard the testimony of a panel of witnesses, who gave an evaluation of the current situation with respect to radiation protection guidance.

COTTON TEXTILE IMPORTS

Conferees, in executive session, agreed to file a conference report on the differences between the Senate- and House-passed versions of H.R. 10788, to regulate imports of agricultural commodities.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR FRIDAY, JUNE 8

(All meetings are open unless otherwise designated)

Senate

Committee on Appropriations, executive, to mark up H.R. 11289, Defense Establishment appropriations, 10:30 a.m., 1223 New Senate Office Building.

Committee on Armed Services, executive, on S. 3170 and H.R. 11221, to increase quarters allowances for military personnel; on recomputation of military retired pay; and on nominations, 2:30 p.m., 212 Old Senate Office Building.

Subcommittee on the National Stockpile, executive, 10 a.m., 235 Old Senate Office Building.

Committee on Banking and Currency, Small Business Subcommittee, on S. 1363 and S. 3096, Government construction set-asides for small businesses, 10 a.m., 5302 New Senate Office Building.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Minerals, Materials, and Fuels Subcommittee, on S.J. Res. 44, to encourage the production of domestic gold, 10 a.m., 3110 New Senate Office Building.

Subcommittee on Territories and Insular Affairs, on S. 2429, to revise the boundaries of the Virgin Islands National Park, St. John, 9:30 a.m., 3112 New Senate Office Building.

Committee on the Judiciary, subcommittee, on the nomination of Oliver Seth, of New Mexico, to be U.S. circuit judge, 10th circuit, 10:30 a.m., 2228 New Senate Office Building.

Subcommittee on Refugees and Escapees, on the Hong Kong refugee situation, to receive the first family of Hong Kong refugees to arrive in the U.S., who will be accompanied by Mrs. Claire Chennault, 11 a.m., 318 Old Senate Office Building.

House

Committee on Agriculture, executive, on sugar legislation, 10 a.m. and 1 p.m., 1310 New House Office Building.

Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, executive, 10 a.m., 320 east front, U.S. Capitol.

Committee on Armed Services, Subcommittee No. 3, on Reserve posture, 9:30 a.m., 304 Old House Office Building.

Subcommittee on Defense Agencies, executive, 9 a.m., 1310 New House Office Building.

Committee on Education and Labor, Special Subcommittee on Labor, on administration of the Davis-Bacon Act, 10 a.m., 429 Old House Office Building.

Committee on Government Operations, Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, on grain storage, 10 a.m., caucus room, Old House Office Building.

Committee on House Administration, Subcommittee on Enrolled Bills and Library, on Franklin D. Roosevelt memorial, 9:30 a.m., 1301 New House Office Building.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, executive, on pending business, 9:45 a.m., 1324 New House Office Building.



Congressional Record

appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed at one time. ¶ The Congressional Record will be furnished by mail to subscribers, free of postage, for \$1.50 per month, payable in advance. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, directly to the Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C. For subscription purposes, 20 daily issues constitute a month. The charge for individual copies varies in proportion to the size of the issue. ¶ Following each session of Congress, the daily Congressional Record is revised, printed, permanently bound and is sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶ With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the Congressional Record.

The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF
BUDGET AND FINANCE

(For information only;
should not be quoted
or cited)

Issued June 13, 1962
For actions of June 12, 1962
87th-2d, No. 95

CONTENTS

| | | |
|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------|
| Access roads.....13 | Education.....19,38 | Lumber.....7 |
| Acreage allotments.....36 | Electrification.....28 | Meat inspection.....1 |
| Administrative provisions.....1 | Employee interchange.....1 | Personnel.....1,32,35 |
| Agricultural attaches.....1 | Farm program.....6,16,26 | Price supports.....39 |
| AID.....9 | Federal aid.....33 | Prices.....27 |
| Appropriations.....9,13,20 | Food storage.....37 | Public debt.....4 |
| Atomic energy.....11 | Foreign aid.....15 | Public lands.....24 |
| Civil defense.....31 | Foreign trade.....3,10,34 | Public works.....5 |
| Dairy.....29 | Forest Service.....13,14 | Reclamation.....2,18,42 |
| Drugs.....22 | Land acquisition.....1 | Recreation.....24 |
| Durum wheat.....39 | Legislative program.....12,25 | Research.....1,22 |
| | Loans.....28 | Rural development.....5 |
| | | Soil conservation.....17 |
| | | Solar energy.....21 |
| | | Textiles.....3,8 |
| | | Timber sales.....14 |
| | | Transportation.....23 |
| | | Vehicles.....1 |
| | | Watersheds.....41 |
| | | Wetlands.....40 |
| | | Wheat.....30,36,39 |
| | | Working Capital Fund.....1 |

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate passed Interior appropriation bill. Reps. Bolton and Harsha criticized farm bill. House received conference report on bill for agricultural import restrictions on nonparticipating countries in multilateral trade agreements. House committee reported foreign trade bill.

HOUSE

1. ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS. Received from this Department a proposed bill "to facilitate the work of the Department of Agriculture"; to Agriculture Committee.

The proposed bill includes provisions as follows: Authorizes this Department to erect research facilities or other structures on land, the use of which is secured for the estimated life of, or need for, the structures; and authorizes the use of funds available to the Department for expenses in connection with acquiring the right to use land for such purposes. Permits the Department to use receipts for reimbursable meat inspection without fiscal year limitation. Authorizes grants for basic and applied research to State agricultural experiment stations and others, including individuals, to implement the programs of this Department. Authorizes this Department to purchase insurance coverage on its vehicles in foreign countries. Authorizes assignment of Agricultural Attaches and related personnel for duty in the continental United States, without regard to the civil service laws and without change

in grade, for not more than three years. Permits employees of this Department, while temporarily involved in a transfer to a State activity under the act of August 2, 1956 (interchange of employees between USDA and the States), to preserve their health benefits in the same manner as benefits under the Civil Service Retirement Act and the Group Life Insurance Act are retained. Authorizes the Department to acquire land by donation, exchange, or purchase at a nominal cost. Amends the present legislation providing for the Working Capital Fund of the Department so as to specifically provide for advances to the fund by agencies of the Department for whom central services are furnished through use of the fund. p. 9450

2. RECLAMATION. Began debate on H. R. 2206, to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance by the Secretary of the Interior of the Fryingpan-Arkansas project, Colo. pp. 9396-401, 9401-29

3. FOREIGN TRADE; TEXTILES. Received the conference report on H. R. 10788, to amend Sec. 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 so as to authorize the President to regulate imports of textiles and textile products from nonparticipation countries of multilateral trade agreements (H. Rept. 1817). The conference report recommends that the Senate recede from its amendments which would have directed the President to negotiate agreements with foreign nations limiting the export to the U. S. of beef and beef products, pork and pork products, fresh and frozen lamb, poultry and poultry products, dairy products, and timber and timber products when in his judgment such imports seriously affect domestic producers; and provide that action taken under the bill should be consistent with trade agreement acts policy. pp. 9434, ~~9451~~

4. PUBLIC DEBT. The Rules Committee reported a resolution for the consideration of H. R. 11990, to provide for a temporary increase in the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act (pp. 9396, 9450). The "Daily Digest" states that the committee "Granted a closed rule, waiving points of order, with 4 hours of debate, and making it in order to consider H. R. 12026 as a substitute for H. R. 11990." p. D462

5. PUBLIC WORKS. As reported, H. R. 10113, the proposed Public Works Acceleration Act, includes provisions as follows: Establishes an Office of Public Works Coordination and Acceleration to encourage coordination of planning policies for public works construction. Requires the Director of the Office to collect information on Federal, State, and local public work activities and to report to the President and Congress at least annually on all public works in the process of being constructed, those which have been or are being planned, and those which should be planned. Requires the Director to utilize existing governmental and nongovernmental services, facilities and information to the fullest extent possible. Requires the Director to prepare and keep current a public works plan for the acceleration of the construction of public works necessary to increase employment and stabilize the economy when needed because of declining economic activity. Authorizes the appropriation of not to exceed \$900 million to be allocated by the President to the heads of Federal departments and agencies to initiate and accelerate public works programs. Provides that not less than \$300 million of the authorization shall be allocated for public works projects in areas designated by the Secretary of Commerce as rural redevelopment areas under the Area Redevelopment Act, provided that at least one-third of any appropriation of less than \$900 million shall be allocated for projects in rural redevelopment areas. Provides that funds allocated by the President shall be available only for projects which can be initiated or accelerated within a reasonable period of time, which meet an essential public need, a substantial portion of which can be completed within a year after initiation or acceleration, which will contribute significantly to reduction of local unemployment, and which are

REGULATION OF IMPORTS OF AGRICULTURAL
COMMODITIES AND PRODUCTS

JUNE 12, 1962.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. COOLEY, from the committee of conference, submitted the
following

CONFERENCE REPORT

[To accompany H.R. 10788]

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10788) to amend section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956, having met after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 2 and 3.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same.

HAROLD D. COOLEY,
W. R. POAGE,
E. C. GATHINGS,
CHARLES B. HOEVEN,
CLIFFORD G. MCINTIRE,

Managers on the Part of the House.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
JAMES O. EASTLAND,
HERMAN E. TALMADGE,
B. EVERETT JORDAN,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
KARL E. MUNDT,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10788), to amend section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate made three amendments to the House bill. The committee of conference has agreed to recommend that the Senate recede from its amendments Nos. 2 and 3 and that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 1.

Amendment No. 1 is purely technical and simply corrects a typographical error that occurred when the bill as reported by the House Committee on Agriculture was printed. The amendment corrects the word "article" to read "articles".

Senate amendment No. 2 would have directed the President to negotiate agreements with foreign nations limiting the export to the United States of beef and beef products, pork and pork products, fresh and frozen lamb, poultry and poultry products, dairy products, and timber and timber products, when in his judgment such imports seriously affect domestic producers. While the only agreement which has been negotiated to date under section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 deals with cotton textiles, section 204 is applicable to all agricultural commodities and products manufactured therefrom. Senate amendment No. 2 gave the President no additional authority with respect to the named commodities, nor did it require him to take any action with respect to those commodities unless, in his judgment, imports of such commodities were seriously affecting domestic producers. Members of both Houses on the committee of conference recognize there are other commodities in addition to cotton textiles that are being seriously affected through excessive imports, and believe the President should in such cases take action under section 204. He has full authority to do so, and the obligation to take whatever action is necessary. While the conferees did not want to interfere in any way with the textile negotiations conducted under section 204, and consequently deleted the language inserted by Senate amendment No. 2, the conferees emphasize the desirability of the steps recommended in that amendment and urge the President to initiate negotiations with foreign countries limiting the export of those agricultural commodities which are suffering serious effects from import competition.

Senate amendment No. 3 provided that action taken under the bill should be consistent with Trade Agreement Acts policy. This would appear to create an indefinite rule and its effects could not be foreseen. The committee of conference therefore recommended that the Senate recede from this amendment.

HAROLD D. COOLEY,
W. R. POAGE,
E. C. GATHINGS,
CHARLES B. HOEVEN,
CLIFFORD G. MCINTIRE,
Managers on the Part of the House.

(1) he shall determine which school districts within the State are in his judgment generally comparable to the school district of the agency for which the computation is being made; and

(2) he shall then divide (A) the aggregate current expenditures, during the second fiscal year preceding the fiscal year for which he is making the computation, which the local educational agencies of such comparable school districts made from revenues derived from local sources, by (B) the aggregate number of children in average daily attendance to whom such agencies provided free public education during such second preceding fiscal year.

The local contribution rate shall be an amount equal to the quotient obtained under clause (2) of this subsection. If, in the judgment of the Commissioner, the current expenditures in those school districts which he has selected under clause (1) are not reasonably comparable because of unusual geographical factors which affect the current expenditures necessary to maintain, in the school district of the local educational agency for which the computation is being made a level of education equivalent to that maintained in such other districts, the Commissioner may increase the local contribution rate for such agency by such amount as he determines will compensate such agency for the increase in current expenditures necessitated by such unusual geographical factors. In no event shall the local contribution rate for any local educational agency in any State (other than Puerto Rico, Wake Island, Guam, or the Virgin Islands) for any fiscal year be less than (i) 50 per centum of the average per pupil expenditure in such State or (ii) 50 per centum of the average per pupil expenditure in the United States (which for the purposes of this sentence and the next sentence means the fifty States and the District of Columbia), but not to exceed the average per pupil expenditure in the State. For the purposes of the preceding sentence the "average per pupil expenditure" in a State, or in the United States, shall be the aggregate current expenditures, during the second fiscal year preceding the fiscal year for which the computation is made, of all local educational agencies in the State, or in the United States, as the case may be (without regard to the sources of funds from which such expenditures are made), divided by the aggregate number of children in average daily attendance to whom such agencies provided free public education during such preceding fiscal year. The local contribution rate for any local educational agency in Puerto Rico, Wake Island, Guam, or the Virgin Islands, or in a State in which a substantial proportion of the land is in unorganized territory for which a State agency is the local educational agency, or in a State in which there is only one local educational agency, shall be determined for any fiscal year by the Commissioner in accordance with policies and principles which will, in his judgment, best effectuate the purposes of this title and most nearly approximate the policies and principles provided herein for determining local contribution rates in other States.

Method of making payments

SEC. 203. (a) No local educational agency shall be entitled to any payment under this title for any fiscal year except upon application therefor, submitted through the State educational agency and filed in accordance with regulations of the Commissioner, which application gives adequate assurance that the local educational agency will submit such reports as the Commissioner may reasonably require to determine the amount to which such agency is entitled under this title.

(b) The Commissioner shall, subject to the provisions of subsection (c), from time

to time pay to each local educational agency, in advance or otherwise, the amount which he estimates such agency is entitled to receive under this title. Such estimates shall take into account the extent (if any) to which any previous estimate of the amount to be paid such agency under this title (whether or not in the same fiscal year) was greater or less than the amount which should have been paid to it. Such payments shall be made through the disbursing facilities of the Department of the Treasury and prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office.

(c) If the funds appropriated for a fiscal year for making payments provided in this title are not sufficient to pay in full the total amounts which the Commissioner estimates all local educational agencies will be entitled to receive under this title for such year, the amount thus appropriated shall be available for payment of a percentage of the amount to which each local educational agency is entitled under this title, such percentage to be equal to the percentage which the amount appropriated is of the amount to which all such agencies are entitled under this section.

TITLE III—GRANTS FOR CONSTRUCTION

Authority for grants

SEC. 301. The Commissioner shall make grants as provided in this title to assist local educational agencies which have had a substantial increase in the number of out-of-State children attending their schools to construct minimum school facilities for such children. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as the Congress may determine to be necessary for carrying out this title. Sums so appropriated, other than sums appropriated for administration, shall remain available until expended.

Establishment of priorities

SEC. 302. The Commissioner shall from time to time set dates by which applications for payments under this title must be filed. The Commissioner shall by regulation prescribe an order of priority, based on relative urgency of need, to be followed in approving applications in the event the funds appropriated under this title and remaining available on any such date for payment to local educational agencies are less than the Federal share of the cost of the projects with respect to which applications have been filed prior to such date (and for which funds under this title have not already been obligated). Only applications meeting the conditions for approval under this title (other than section 305(b)(2)(C)) shall be considered applications for purposes of the preceding sentence.

Federal share for any project

SEC. 303. Subject to section 304 (which imposes limitations on the total of the payments which may be made to any local educational agency), the Federal share of the cost of a project under this title shall be equal to such cost, but in no case to exceed the cost, in the school district of the applicant, of constructing minimum school facilities, and in no case to exceed the cost in such district of constructing minimum school facilities for the estimated number of children who will be in the membership of the schools of such agency at the close of the increase period and who will otherwise be without such facilities at such time. For the purposes of the preceding sentence, the number of such children who will otherwise be without such facilities at such time shall be determined by reference to those facilities which (1) are built or under contract as of the date on which the Commissioner set, under section 302, the earliest date on or before which the application for such project was filed, or (2) as of the date the application for such project is approved, are included in a project the application

for which has been approved under this title.

Limitation on total payments to any local educational agency

SEC. 304. (a) Subject to the limitations in subsections (c) and (d), the total of the payments to a local educational agency under this title may not exceed the estimated increase, since the base year, in the number of out-of-State children, multiplied by 50 per centum of the average per pupil cost of constructing minimum school facilities in the State in which the school district of such agency is situated. In computing for any local educational agency the number of children in an increase under this section, the estimated number of children described in the preceding sentence who will be in the schools of such agency at the close of the increase period shall be compared with the estimated number of such children in average daily membership of the schools of such agency during the base year.

(b) A local educational agency shall not be eligible to have any amount included in its maximum by reason of subsection (a) unless the increase in children referred to in such subsection, prior to the application of the limitation in subsection (c), is at least ten and is equal to at least 1 per centum of the number of all children who were in average daily membership of the schools of such agency during the base year.

(c) If (1) the estimated number of children who are not out-of-State children who will be in the membership of the schools of a local educational agency at the close of the increase period is less than (2) 107 per centum of the number of such children who were in the average daily membership of such agency during the base year, the total number of children counted for purposes of subsection (a) with respect to such agency shall be reduced by the difference between (1) and (2) thereof. For purposes of this subsection, all children in the membership of a local educational agency shall be counted as children who are not out-of-State children except children whose membership in the base year and increase period was compared in computing an increase which meets the requirements of subsection (b).

(d) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsections (b) and (c) of this section, whenever and to the extent that, in his judgment, exceptional circumstances exist which make such action necessary to avoid inequity and avoid defeating the purposes of this title, the Commissioner may do any one or more of the following: (1) he may waive or reduce any percentage requirement in subsection (b); (2) he may waive the requirement contained in the first sentence of subsection (c) or reduce the percentage specified in clause (2) of such sentence.

(e) If—

(1) the first year of the increase period for an application made by a local educational agency constitutes the second year of the increase period for a previous application made by such agency under this title, and

(2) any payment has been or may be made to such agency on the basis of such previous application,

then, in determining under this section the total of the payments which may be made to such agency on the basis of the later application, the total number of children counted for purposes of subsection (a) may not exceed—

(3) the number of children whose membership at the close of the increase period for the later application is compared with membership in the base year for purposes of such subsection, minus

(4) the number of such children whose membership at the close of the increase period for the previous application was compared with membership in the base year for purposes of such subsection.

Applications

SEC. 305. (a) No payment may be made to any local educational agency under this title except upon application therefor which is submitted through the appropriate State educational agency and is filed with the Commissioner in accordance with regulations prescribed by him.

(b) (1) Each application by a local educational agency shall set forth the project for the construction of school facilities for such agency with respect to which it is filed, and shall contain or be supported by—

(A) a description of the project and the site therefor, preliminary drawings of the school facilities to be constructed thereon, and such other information relating to the project as may reasonably be required by the Commissioner;

(B) assurance that such agency has or will have title to the site, or the right to construct upon such site school facilities as specified in the application and to maintain such school facilities on such site for a period of not less than twenty years after the completion of the construction;

(C) assurance that such agency has legal authority to undertake the construction of the project and to finance any non-Federal share of the cost thereof as proposed, and assurance that adequate funds to defray any such non-Federal share will be available when needed;

(D) assurance that such agency will cause work on the project to be commenced within a reasonable time and prosecuted to completion with reasonable diligence;

(E) assurance that the rates of pay for laborers and mechanics engaged in the construction will be not less than the prevailing local wage rates for similar work as determined in accordance with Public Law Numbered 403 of the Seventy-fourth Congress, approved August 30, 1935, as amended;

(F) assurance that the school facilities of such agency will be available to the children for whose education contributions are provided in this title on the same terms, in accordance with the laws of the State in which the school district of such agency is situated, as they are available to other children in such school district; and

(G) assurance that such agency will from time to time prior to the completion of the project submit such reports relating to the project as the Commissioner may reasonably require.

(2) The Commissioner shall approve any application if he finds (A) that the requirements of paragraph (1) have been met and that approval of the project would not result in payments in excess of those permitted by sections 303 and 304. (B) after consultation with the State and local educational agencies, that the project is not inconsistent with overall State plans for the construction of school facilities, and (C) that there are sufficient Federal funds available to pay the Federal share of the cost of such project and of all other projects for which Federal funds have not already been obligated and applications for which, under section 302, have a higher priority.

(c) No application under this title shall be disapproved in whole or in part until the Commissioner of Education has afforded the local educational agency reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing.

Payments

SEC. 306. (a) Upon approving the application of any local educational agency under section 305, the Commissioner of Education shall pay to such agency an amount equal to 10 per centum of the Federal share of the cost of the project. After final drawings and specifications have been approved by the Commissioner of Education and the construction contract has been entered into, the Commissioner shall, in accordance with regulations prescribed by him and at such

times and in such installments as may be reasonable, pay to such agency the remainder of the Federal share of the cost of the project.

(b) Any funds paid to a local educational agency under this title and not expended for the purposes for which paid shall be repaid to the Treasury of the United States.

Withholding of payments

SEC. 307. (a) Whenever the Commissioner of Education, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to a local educational agency, finds (1) that there is a substantial failure to comply with the drawings and specifications for the project, (2) that any funds paid to a local educational agency under this title have been diverted from the purposes for which paid, or (3) that any assurance given in an application is not being or cannot be carried out, the Commissioner may forthwith notify such agency that no further payment will be made under this title with respect to such agency until there is no longer any failure to comply or the diversion or default has been corrected or, if compliance or correction is impossible, until such agency repays or arranges for the repayment of Federal moneys which have been diverted or improperly expended.

(b) The final refusal of the Commissioner to approve part or all of any application under this title, and the Commissioner's final action under subsection (a) of this section, shall be subject to judicial review on the record, in the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which the local educational agency is located, in accordance with the provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act.

REGULATION OF IMPORTS OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES AND PRODUCTS

Mr. ALBERT (at the request of Mr. COOLEY) submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 10788) to amend section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1817)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10788) to amend section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956, having met after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 2 and 3.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same.

HAROLD D. COOLEY,
W. R. POAGE,
E. C. GATHINGS,
CHARLES B. HOEVEN,
CLIFFORD G. MCINTIRE,

Managers on the Part of the House.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
JAMES O. EASTLAND,
HERMAN E. TALMADGE,
B. EVERETT JORDAN,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
KARL E. MUNDT,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10788), to amend section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon

and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate made three amendments to the House bill. The committee of conference has agreed to recommend that the Senate recede from its amendments Nos. 2 and 3 and that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 1.

Amendment No. 1 is purely technical and simply corrects a typographical error that occurred when the bill as reported by the House Committee on Agriculture was printed. The amendment corrects the word "article" to read "articles."

Senate amendment No. 2 would have directed the President to negotiate agreements with foreign nations limiting the export to the United States of beef and beef products, pork and pork products, fresh and frozen lamb, poultry and poultry products, dairy products, and timber and timber products, when in his judgment such imports seriously affect domestic producers. While the only agreement which has been negotiated to date under section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 deals with cotton textiles, section 204 is applicable to all agricultural commodities and products manufactured therefrom. Senate amendment No. 2 gave the President no additional authority with respect to the named commodities, nor did it require him to take any action with respect to those commodities unless, in his judgment, imports of such commodities were seriously affecting domestic producers. Members of both Houses on the committee of conference recognize there are other commodities in addition to cotton textiles that are being seriously affected through excessive imports, and believe the President should in such cases take action under section 204. He has full authority to do so, and the obligation to take whatever action is necessary. While the conferees did not want to interfere in any way with the textile negotiations conducted under section 204, and consequently deleted the language inserted by Senate amendment No. 2, the conferees emphasize the desirability of the steps recommended in that amendment and urge the President to initiate negotiations with foreign countries limiting the export of those agricultural commodities which are suffering serious effects from import competition.

Senate amendment No. 3 provided that action taken under the bill should be consistent with trade agreement acts policy. This would appear to create an indefinite rule and its effects could not be foreseen. The committee of conference therefore recommended that the Senate recede from this amendment.

HAROLD D. COOLEY,
W. R. POAGE,
E. C. GATHINGS,
CHARLES B. HOEVEN,
CLIFFORD G. MCINTIRE,

Managers on the Part of the House.

CONSUMER FINANCE COMPANIES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the following bill has been added to the list of bills from the Committee on Ways and Means previously announced to be called up by unanimous consent this week: H.R. 8824—a bill to modify personal holding company tax in case of consumer finance companies.

These six bills may be called up for consideration tomorrow.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR WEDNESDAY AND THURSDAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to advise that after the vote on the Fryingpan-Arkansas project tomorrow we shall proceed with the considera-

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF
BUDGET AND FINANCE

(For information only;
should not be quoted
or cited)

Issued June 15, 1962
For actions of June 14, 1962
87th-2d, No. 97

| | |
|---------------------|----------|
| Foreign trade..... | 1,13,21 |
| Forest Service..... | 2 |
| Hay..... | 20 |
| Milk..... | 42 |
| Personnel..... | 10,32 |
| Poultry..... | 2,21 |
| Public debt..... | 3,40 |
| Reclamation..... | 16,30 |
| Roads..... | 18,41 |
| Small business..... | 15,24,36 |
| Soil bank..... | 4 |
| Stockpiling..... | 11,22 |
| Sugar..... | 6,39 |
| Taxation..... | 12,27 |
| Textiles..... | 1,9 |
| Tobacco..... | 43 |
| Wheat..... | 19,34 |
| Wildlife..... | 44 |
| Youth corps..... | 8,38 |

CONTENTS

| | |
|--------------------------|------------|
| Appropriations..... | 2 |
| Civil defense..... | 23 |
| Communications..... | 28 |
| Conservation reserve.... | 20 |
| Consumers..... | 31 |
| Contracts..... | 7,14 |
| Dairy..... | 35 |
| Electrification..... | 17 |
| Expenditures..... | 33 |
| Export control..... | 13 |
| Farm ownership..... | 45 |
| Farm program..... | 25,37 |
| Food for peace..... | 29 |
| Foreign aid..... | 5,26,34,45 |

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate concurred in House amendments to measure to defer proclamation of wheat allotments and quotas. Senate passed bill to continue authority for harvesting hay on conservation reserve lands. Sen. Tower criticized USDA handling of Estes case. Both Houses agreed to conference report on bill for agricultural import restrictions on nonparticipating countries in multilateral trade agreements. House passed continuing resolution for second supplemental appropriations. House Rules Committee cleared foreign aid authorization bill. Rep. Cooley announced intention to report sugar bill. Sen. Talmadge submitted and discussed measure to extend time for filing tobacco allotment leases. Rep. Stratton introduced and discussed bill to provide legal authority for certain milk-marketing order compensatory payments.

HOUSE

1. FOREIGN TRADE; TEXTILES. Both houses agreed to the conference report on H. R. 10788, to amend Sec. 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 so as to authorize the President to regulate imports of textiles and textile products from nonparticipating countries of multilateral trade agreements. Both houses agreed to H. Con. Res. 493, to correct an error in the spelling in the conference report on this bill. This bill will now be sent to the President. pp. 9725, 9811-2
2. APPROPRIATIONS. Passed without amendment H. J. Res. 745, appropriating funds for those items in the second supplemental appropriation bill which were apportioned on a basis indicating a necessity for a deficiency or supplemental estimate. This would provide \$37,000,000 for Forest Service (\$36,000,000 for fighting forest fires and \$1,000,000 for control of forest pests), and \$425,000 for poultry inspection (AMS). It would not provide funds for the screwworm eradication or Farmers Home Administration items. (pp. 9705-6). The

Appropriations Committee earlier reported this resolution without amendment (H. Rept. 1822). pp. 9752-3

3. PUBLIC DEBT. By a vote of 211 to 192, passed without amendment H. R. 11990, to provide for a temporary increase to \$308 billion in the public debt limit. pp. 9706-22
4. SOIL BANK. Received from this Department a proposed bill "to amend section 107 (d) of the Soil Bank Act"; to Agriculture Committee. This proposed legislation would clarify the authority of the Secretary to prescribe by regulation the types of violations which are of such a substantial nature as to warrant the termination of soil bank contracts. p. 9752
5. FOREIGN AID. The Rules Committee reported a resolution for the consideration of H. R. 11921, the proposed Foreign Assistance Act of 1962. pp. 9722, 9753
6. SUGAR. Rep. Cooley announced that he will introduce a clean sugar bill on Fri., June 15, and the Agriculture Committee will report it on the same day, providing the Committee is granted permission to sit during general debate on Fri. Rep. Quie objected to a request by Rep. Cooley to allow the Agriculture Committee to meet during the session of the House on Fri. and Rep. Cooley announced that he would renew his request on Fri. Rep. Quie said he would not object if minority views were prepared by that time. Rep. Smith, Va., announced that the Rules Committee will consider a rule on the bill as soon as it is reported. pp. 9722-4
7. CONTRACTS. Began debate on H. R. 11677, to prohibit discrimination on account of sex in the payment of wages by certain employers engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce and to provide for the restitution of wages lost by employees by reason of any such discrimination. pp. 9725-7
8. YOUTH CONSERVATION. Rep. Olsen discussed the bill which would establish a Youth Conservation Corps, saying, "I support this bill--and, indeed, feel we cannot pass it too quickly." pp. 9738-9
9. TEXTILES. Rep. Alexander inserted a speech by a textile executive, "Our Textile Export Challenge." pp. 9739-41
10. PERSONNEL. Rep. Fogarty inserted a speech by Secretary Hodges before the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped. pp. 9737-8
11. STOCKPILING. Received from the Office of Emergency Planning the semiannual report on the strategic and critical materials stockpiling program for the period July 1 to December 31, 1961. p. 9752
12. TAXATION. Received from Treasury a proposed bill "to amend section 172 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a 7-year net operating loss carryover for certain regulated public utilities"; to Ways and Means Committee. p. 9752
13. FOREIGN TRADE; EXPORT CONTROL. The Banking and Currency Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) with amendments H. R. 11309, to provide for continuation of authority for regulation exports. p. D475
14. CONTRACTS. The Banking and Currency Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) with amendments H. R. 11500, to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended. p. D475
15. SMALL BUSINESS. The Banking and Currency Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) with amendments H. R. 12121, to amend the Small Business

CORRECTION OF ROLLCALL

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, on the last rollcall I understand I am not recorded. I was present and voted "yea." I ask that the rollcall be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

REGULATION OF IMPORTS OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES AND PRODUCTS

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 10788) to amend section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement see proceedings of the House of June 12, 1962.)

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

(Mr. GATHINGS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

[Mr. GATHINGS' remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

REGULATION OF IMPORTS AND AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES AND PRODUCTS

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution (H. Con. Res. 493) to correct an error in the spelling in the conference report just adopted.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That in the enrollment of the bill (H.R. 10788) to amend section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956, the Clerk of the House is authorized and directed to make the following correction: In line 12, on page 1, strike out "agreements" and insert "agreement".

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CORRECTION OF RECORD

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, in the RECORD for June 13, 1962, page 9637, the first three sentences should read as follows:

Mr. Speaker, we have had some confessions here today, and I would like to make one. I voted against increasing the debt limit under the previous administration and have voted against all increases heretofore granted under the present administration. I cannot vote for the increase contemplated in the bill under consideration and never

expect to vote to increase the debt limit in the absence of a grave national emergency such as war.

I ask unanimous consent that the foregoing appear in the permanent RECORD in lieu of the first two sentences appearing in my remarks on page 9637.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the correction will be made.

There was no objection.

EQUAL PAY ACT OF 1962

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 677 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11677) to prohibit discrimination on account of sex in the payment of wages by certain employers engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce and to provide for the restitution of wages lost by employees by reason of any such discrimination. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommitt.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes of my time to the gentleman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE], and in the meantime I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 677 provides for the consideration of H.R. 11677, a bill to prohibit discrimination on account of sex in the payments of wages by certain employers engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce and to provide for the restitution of wages lost by employees by reason of any such discrimination. The resolution provides for an open rule with 1 hour of general debate.

The objective sought by H.R. 11677 is wage justice for working men and women.

The legislation prohibits an employer having employees engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce from discriminating between his employees by paying lower wages to one sex than he pays to the other sex for substantially the same job. "Work of comparable character on jobs the performance of which requires comparable skill" must be paid for on an equal nondiscriminatory basis. Payment of different rates is permitted, however, pursuant to nondiscriminatory seniority or merit increase systems or, again, where such differential is based upon a bona fide job classification program.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 677.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman insist on his point of order?

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the distinguished Speaker, should we meet in the morning at 11 o'clock?

The SPEAKER. The Chair has no control over that, of course.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my point of order.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 677 makes in order the consideration of the bill H.R. 11677 to prohibit discrimination on account of sex in the payment of wages by certain employers engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, and to provide for the restitution of wages lost by employees by reason of any such discrimination.

Mr. Speaker, I am reasonably sure—as sure as one can be of anything in this House—that there is no objection to this legislation. I do not see how anyone would dare be against it. It would be like being against motherhood. So I have no qualms about the passage of the legislation.

But I would like to point out one thing to the House. They have heard me speak on this subject very often, and with very little effect, and I have no doubt this will be the same this afternoon. This is merely a bite at the cherry. You are going to go on having bills of this kind on different types of discrimination until you finally decide in your wisdom to allow the States to pass an equal rights amendment to the Constitution.

Now, that could have been done many years ago. It could be done at any time, but there is a committee that happens to stand in the way of this legislation, that is blocking its submission to the House. I bring that up because the Committee on Rules is very often to blame for these things, but there are other committees that do the same, and in this case the Committee on the Judiciary has held up the equal rights amendments for at least 15 or 20 years now.

Now, the reason I bring this point up, Mr. Speaker, is that the people who oppose the amendments say there is no discrimination at all on account of sex, yet here we come today with a bill that points out very clearly that there is. This is not the only discrimination. There are other discriminations throughout the country. However, as I stated at the beginning of my remarks, this is a step in the right direction; this is something that at least we can all go out for and that we can all vote for, and I certainly hope that without too much ado this legislation will be passed.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I am very happy to yield to my friend from Iowa, with pleasure, always.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentlewoman. Does the gentlewoman know how many amendments there are to this bill and how late it is proposed to go in this session on this bill?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I will say to the gentleman from Iowa that I know of two amendments. Now, there may be more, but I do know of two or three, and I think there will be a little discussion on those.

Mr. GROSS. I understand there are a number of amendments, many more than two amendments, to this bill. Is it proposed to adopt the rule tonight, or what is proposed to be done?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Oh, the gentleman is attributing a great deal of power to me that I do not have. I have not the faintest idea.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. I would like to advise that it is the hope of the leadership that we will proceed to the adoption of the rule and then discontinue legislative business until tomorrow.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentlewoman.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH].

(Mrs. CHURCH asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in hearty support of H.R. 11677, the Equal Pay Act of 1962. This bill seeks to achieve the meritorious purpose of prohibiting discrimination on account of sex in payment of wages in those companies engaged in interstate commerce and with foreign nations and employing more than 25 employees. I think this legislation, however, is the first step toward the establishment of those equal rights for women for which I have long fought in the Congress and which I believe to have been proved so merited as to justify early action. It is my hope, indeed, that the passage of this bill, as a first step, will help, not hinder favorable consideration of other pending legislation on this important subject.

It may once have been true Mr. Speaker, as is so frequently stated by the masculine segment of our population, that women worked largely to achieve extra money or what in earlier days was known as pin money.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the House is not in order.

Mrs. CHURCH. Even if that fact had once been true, the situation in 1962 has become strikingly different. The 24 million women in the labor force in this country, now by large majority work because it is necessary for them to work to contribute to essential living expenses. To them equal pay for equal work is not a slogan; it is a matter of necessity; it is a matter of justice.

This fact has been recognized in 22 States which already have equal pay laws, although, admittedly, in some instances, such laws are at present ineffective.

Again expressing the hope that this legislation will prove a stimulant rather than a deterrent to consideration and

passage of other legislation giving women the equality that they deserve, I would respectfully urge that the rule be passed and that the House pass H.R. 11677 overwhelmingly.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. CHURCH. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. DOMINICK. As I understood the statement of the gentlewoman, the gentlewoman indicated that the bill was limited to employers engaged in interstate commerce. But as I read the bill—and this is an amendment here—commerce applies to any person who is doing business within a State. Does not the gentlewoman agree?

Mrs. CHURCH. It is my understanding that the bill applies only to commerce among the several States and with foreign nations, as stated in section 2(b).

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANDRUM].

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, certainly, as the distinguished gentlewomen who have preceded me say, none, and certainly I would not, want to support any move that would discriminate against women in employment having equal pay for equal work. I believe, however, that women and some others, perhaps, in their enthusiasm to get this through legislation may be becoming the victims of a bill that is something other than what this bill purports to be. This is a bill disguised in a lot of sweet-scented kimonos, with a lot of tricks and a lot of pitfalls in it that can wreak havoc with women in employment and can work untold harassment on the employers of this country.

Mr. Speaker I desire to pose a few questions for the membership to think about in considering this bill before it reaches the stage of final passage, in the hope that it may be amended to be a little more directed at the point we have in mind. For example, the bill uses the term "equal pay for comparable work." Now, I want to pose this question: The term "comparable" is not defined in the bill. What would the Secretary of the Department of Labor interpret this to mean? The Secretary of Labor is empowered under this bill to define the term "comparable." Does that mean that one with greater skills than another, although they are doing work that may be comparable, would be paid the same? Is it not better to have this term "comparable" to be more limited? Let us look at this: The fact is that the hardship under the bill would be fixed upon the blue-collar women where the Department of Labor could hold that all manufacturing jobs in a plant were comparable, although the blue-collar women under industry practice are not able to service their machines or do heavy lifting, but do have certain privileges under State safety codes.

By requiring the same rates for comparable work, the inevitable result would be the discharge of blue-collar women and the hiring of additional men. Is this the intended result of the bill? As long as this word is there without limit-

ing the discretion that is handed on a platter to the Secretary of Labor, it is inevitable that that is likely to be the result. Now, we come down to another section of the bill that bothers me about back wages. The bill requires not only the payment of back wages but I quote from it:

An additional amount not to exceed the back wages found to be due.

This smacks of punitive damages. Why? Is it necessary that when we find a person not complying with the new law, that we go in and punish him? Is it not enough just to see that he pays interest on the back wages and not double or sometimes treble? Another thing: The provisions of the bill shall be included in Walsh-Healey contracts. Why? The "employer" definition sets out general coverage applicable to all. Why single out Walsh-Healey contractors for special provision? This is another very dangerous and, as it seems to me, punitive provision of the bill which, in my judgment, cannot do any good to women employees.

The bill provides for blacklisting for "any person finally determined to have violated any of the provisions of this Act," so as to prohibit the awarding of any contract by the U.S. Government.

It does not say that it must be wilful; it does not say that it must be continuous. It just says:

Any person finally determined to have violated any of the provisions of this Act.

What do you propose to do with this? Who is it you are after? What is it you are after? If you are seeking equal pay then why go back and dig up all of these technicalities and lay a lot of discretionary power in the hands of the Secretary of Labor?

The bill, by relieving employers of State law—and listen to this, you who are States righters, if there are any among you—the bill, by relieving employers of State law, in effect, nullifies the act of 22 States in this field. Although the Secretary would be empowered to cede to a State agency jurisdiction, experience under Taft-Hartley shows this to be meaningless since no cessions in practice occur.

I repeat that none seek to require women employed in industry and commerce to work for wages less than those paid men. I hope that my daughter will make as much as or more, if her abilities will permit, than her brother. It would suit me fine if my wife made more money than I. But I do not want it to occur and I do not believe any responsible women want it to occur under the provisions of a bill that sets up the Secretary of Labor as a czar to harass all of the employers of this country. Your country banks, your retailing institutions, your manufacturing establishments that employ women in the great majority, are going in the main to be the people who will get so angry with this thing until you ladies—I know they call you gentlewomen here, but I am going to call you ladies—will be the ones who will eventually be victimized by this bill under the terms it now carries.

These projects also continue an established trend. The Commerce Department estimates 1961 Latin-American plant spending by U.S. companies jumped 40 percent over 1960 while outlays in Asia and other underdeveloped areas also rose.

For several companies, heavy overseas spending this year also is dictated by long-range programs launched some time ago and now in full swing. Ford Motor Co. in 1960 began a \$225 million program, scheduled for completion in mid-1963, to raise the car and truck producing capacity of its British subsidiary 50 percent. Last year it also kicked off a \$125 million program, to end late this year, for a 50 percent increase in capacity of its German subsidiary.

On all these programs, the Kennedy tax program so far is having only a marginal effect. Reed Roller Bit Co. of Houston, has decided to delay construction of a \$1.5 million plant in Holland, which had been scheduled to start later this year, until it can "see how things settle out," says John Maher, president. But nearly all other executives queried say 1962 spending plans are far too advanced to be delayed now, whatever Congress does.

WHAT BILL WOULD DO

In future years, however, the impact of the tax bill could be much greater in the event that it passes Congress with its present foreign-tax provisions intact. Basically, the bill provides that earnings of an overseas manufacturing subsidiary of a U.S. company will be subject to U.S. tax in the year earned, unless reinvested in the business or in an underdeveloped country within 3 months of the close of the taxable year. Earnings of a nonmanufacturing subsidiary could escape taxation only if reinvested in an underdeveloped country; they would be taxed if used to finance a new plant in an industrialized nation, such as one of the Common Market countries. Earnings from rents, royalties, copyrights, or patents abroad would be taxed no matter where or how they were reinvested.

Almost exactly half the companies surveyed say they probably will cut back, or at least go slow, on foreign capital spending in 1963 and future years if these provisions become law. They include such names as Coca-Cola Co. and Eastman Kodak Co., both among the most active firms in foreign plant building.

The principal reason foreign outlays might be curbed, executives say, is that most foreign capital expenditures are financed out of retained tax-free profits of existing foreign plants or sales subsidiaries, usually saved over a period of years. So, says Michel Bergerac, director of overseas operations for Cannon Electric Co., if the tax bill is passed in its present form, "we just wouldn't have as much money to spend" on foreign plants in the future. Cannon, a Los Angeles maker of electrical connectors, is spending \$3 million this year for additional manufacturing facilities in Japan and England.

WHERE MONEY COMES FROM

Of \$5 billion spent by U.S. concerns in 1960 for foreign plants and equipment and other assets, the Commerce Department estimates, some \$2.9 billion came from retained profits and depreciation allowances of the foreign plants themselves. Foreign investors and lenders put up another \$1.1 billion, while only \$1 billion, or 20 percent of the total, was sent abroad from the United States. For some companies, the proportion of foreign-plant-building funds derived from foreign sources goes even higher; Armco Steel Corp. says 90 percent of the money it spends overseas is raised overseas.

Many executives also charge that the tax bill would make their overseas operations less competitive with foreign-owned plants, thereby lessening their incentive to set up shop abroad. If the tax bill passes "we won't

be able to compete as well with manufacturers abroad because they'll have a better tax structure than we have," says John Porter, finance manager of Ampex Corp., Redwood City, Calif., electronics concern. Many foreign countries have lower corporate income taxes than the United States, and also more liberal depreciation allowances.

In addition, several companies say the stiffer taxes provided by the new bill would mean their foreign plants would be no more profitable than their U.S. operations. And if foreign plants "were not more profitable than domestic ventures we might as well stay at home," says an official of a major New York chemical company which plans to spend \$10 to \$14 million on overseas factories this year, against \$7 million in 1961.

BLOW TO THE UNDEVELOPED?

In particular, many executives insist, they need some sort of tax inducement to offset the risks of investing in underdeveloped countries. So, they say, passage of the tax bill in its present form would cause them to cut back especially sharply on new plants in these poor lands—even though some of the bill's provisions seem designed to spur such investment.

"The tax program would probably eliminate even consideration of expanding in areas such as India," asserts Albert A. Kornhauser, treasurer of Controls Co. of America, in Chicago. A Midwestern chemical concern which is reconsidering planned future expansion in southeast Asia and Africa because of the tax bill says: "There must be some incentives to expand in those areas where investments can be snuffed out quickly by such burdens as foreign taxation and political disturbance—all complicated enough already by differences in language, customs, currencies, and exchange rates."

This isn't the only way in which the bill might defeat its own purpose, businessmen warn. In part, the bill is designed to ease the U.S. balance-of-payments problem by discouraging businessmen from sending dollars abroad to build new plants. The balance-of-payments problem refers to the persistent excess of total U.S. spending, lending, and investing abroad over foreign spending, lending, and investing in the United States.

P. & G.'S BALANCE OF PAYMENT

But several companies cite detailed figures to prove that their foreign plants over the years return far more dollars to the United States than they take out. Procter & Gamble Co., the big soapmaker, says it sent only \$11 million abroad to build plants during the decade of the 1950's, with the rest of the investment coming from foreign sources. During the same period, says Dean Fite, a P. & G. vice president, these plants sent back \$47 million in dividends. Also, he says, they bought \$247 million worth of raw materials from the United States.

Du Pont Co. says that in the 10 years ended in 1961 its foreign operations returned \$1,280 million more to the United States than they took out. Further, it forecasts a surplus of about \$800 million in the next 5 years.

Many companies, of course, including some of the Nation's biggest, say tax considerations are only a minor factor in planning foreign plants, and will have little effect on their future investments. International Business Machines Corp., which operates 16 plants in 14 foreign countries, says the tax bill will "affect us only in a minor way." General Electric Co., which has 30 plants in 11 foreign countries, indicates it would not let higher taxes stand in the way if it decided building a plant was the only way to sell GE products in a country with a high tariff wall or other stiff restrictions on imports.

But even these companies grumble bitterly about the tax bill. They charge that the Government for many years encouraged

them to build foreign plants to help the economies of friendly nations. Now, complains F. T. Quirk, assistant secretary of Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., these investments "are suddenly regarded in important Government circles as being highly undesirable, detrimental to the American economy, and based upon selfish motives."

TENNESSEAN FAVORS KING-ANDERSON BILL

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I received an interesting letter today, written on tablet paper, and in a form clearly understood. The writer of the letter, a constituent of mine, makes a simple point, but he makes it in a very telling way. I should like to read the letter.

DEAR SENATOR: Long before my recent illness I was for the King-Anderson bill, but since I received a hospital bill for \$1,678, I am now strongly for it.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10788) to amend section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 493) that the Clerk of the House be authorized and directed to make a correction in said resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

CORRECTION IN ENROLLMENT OF HOUSE BILL 10788

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. President, I submit a concurrent resolution coming over from the House of Representatives and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be stated. The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That in the enrollment of the bill (H.R. 10788) to amend section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956, the Clerk of the House is authorized and directed to make the following correction:

In line 12, on page 1, strike out "agreements" and insert "agreement".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 493) was considered and agreed to.

REGULATION OF IMPORTS OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES AND PRODUCTS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10788) to amend section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. METCALF in the chair). The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report. (For conference report, see House proceedings of June 12, 1962, p. 9434, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. President, the Senate made three amendments to the House bill.

The first Senate amendment was merely technical to correct a typographical error and the House receded from its disagreement to that amendment.

The second Senate amendment directed the President to negotiate agreements under section 204 of the 1956 act restricting the importation into the United States of a number of commodities when in his judgment such imports seriously affect domestic producers. This amendment gave the President no additional authority and it did not require any action; but members of the Conference Committee felt that it might interfere with the textile negotiations currently being conducted under section 204. Under the Conference agreement the Senate would recede from this amendment with the recognition, expressed in the statement of managers on the part of the House, that there are other commodities that are being seriously affected through excessive imports and that the President should, in such cases, take action under section 204.

The third Senate amendment provided that action taken under the bill should be consistent with Trade Agreements Acts policy. The conferees on the part of the House felt that this created an indefinite rule, the effects of which could not be foreseen, and under the Conference Report the Senate would recede from this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF RULE XIX

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1481, Senate Resolution 37.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 37) to amend rule XIX relative to the transgression of the rule in debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the resolution was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That paragraph 4 of rule XIX of the Standing Rules of the Senate (relating to debate) is amended to read as follows:

"4. If any Senator, in speaking or otherwise, in the opinion of the Presiding Officer transgresses the rules of the Senate the Presiding Officer shall, either on his own motion or at the request of any other Senator, call him to order; and when a Senator shall be

called to order he shall take his seat, and may not proceed without leave of the Senate, which, if granted, shall be upon motion that he be allowed to proceed in order, which motion shall be determined without debate. Any Senator directed by the Presiding Officer to take his seat, and any Senator requesting the Presiding Officer to require a Senator to take his seat, may appeal from the ruling of the chair, which appeal shall be open to debate."

ADVERSE REPORTS BY THE COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I introduced the resolution, which has just been agreed to by the Senate, along with eight other proposed rules changes early in the present Congress.

My purpose in addressing the Senate this afternoon is, first, to express my keen disappointment that the other proposed changes in the rules were not reported favorably to the Senate by the Committee on Rules and Administration, and to comment on the report of the Subcommittee on Standing Rules of the Senate, subsequently approved by the Committee on Rules and Administration, which was adverse to the other proposals. I intend to return to the subject of the need for modernizing the rules of the Senate from time to time as the occasion presents itself during the remainder of this session. My reason for so doing is my strong conviction that the present rules and procedures of the Senate are unsuited to the needs of the country and of the modern world.

I reiterate, for perhaps the 25th time, Woodrow Wilson's famous statement that the Senate is the only legislative body in the entire world which is unable to act when its majority is ready for action. This may well have been a not too serious defect in the procedures of this body in the old, easygoing days of the 19th century. Today, I consider the Senate's procedures a clear and present danger to the proper carrying out of the constitutional purposes of this body. In my judgment, Congress has clung to outmoded customs and prerogatives which should have disappeared before World War I, and that became not only antiquated but dangerous with the advent of the atomic bomb.

Congress is still functioning today pretty much as it did at the turn of the century. Its machinery is cumbersome and its legislative structure old and creaky. The Senate is still thought to be the greatest deliberative body in the world. Yet we spend very little time deliberating and we refuse, even in the face of crises, to change our leisurely pace or to forego luxury the country can no longer afford: talkathons which bore the voters as much as they bore ourselves.

I suggest that there would be very little talk about Presidential grab for power or Supreme Court usurpation of power if Congress were on its toes and exercising its powers as the Founding Fathers expected the legislative branch of the Government to do.

Madam President, these views are shared by others. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the

conclusion of my remarks an interesting article entitled "Would Kick in Pants Help? The President and the Supreme Court Aren't Grabbing Power, but Are Filling a Vacuum Left by Congress," written by Inez Robb.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. NEUBERGER in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. CLARK. Madam President, with this preliminary statement, I should like to turn to each of the eight proposed changes in the Senate rules which I submitted last year, which were unfavorably reported by the Subcommittee on Standing Rules of the Senate.

The first is Senate Resolution 9, which would amend rule XXIV of the Standing Rules of the Senate by requiring that a majority of the Senate members of a committee of conference should have indicated by their votes their sympathy with the bill as passed, and their concurrence in the prevailing opinion of the Senate on the matters in disagreement with the House of Representatives which occasioned the appointment of the committee.

The majority of the subcommittee reported adversely on this proposed change in the rules. I am happy to note that the able junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON] dissented from that report and was of the view that the objective of the rule was desirable, although its application should be broadened to cover all conference committee appointments and not limited to cases where rollcall votes had been held.

In the report of the majority of the subcommittee it is stated:

In the vast majority of instances the appointment of Senate conferees on the basis of their seniority on the committee which reported the bill in conference has proven satisfactory.

Madam President, it is quite true that at any one session there are very few complaints regarding the action of Senate conferees, but this is because a majority of the Senate conferees usually do, in fact, reflect the prevailing view of the Senate. In addition, the majority of the subcommittee is in error when it takes the position that ordinarily the Senate conferees are appointed on the basis of their seniority on the committee. Actually, that is done by very few of the Senate committees. So far as I recall, the Finance Committee is almost the only one from which Members are appointed conferees entirely on the basis of their seniority. In fact, so far as I know, the Finance Committee is the only Senate committee which does not use the device of subcommittees, which is used by all other committees to expedite proposed legislation. On all the committees on which I serve—the Banking and Currency Committee, the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, and the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service—it has been almost the invariable practice to appoint as Senate conferees, not the senior members of the full committee, but the members of the subcommittee which considered the proposed legislation in the first instance and reported the bill to the full committee.

87TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. CON. RES. 493

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JUNE 14, 1962

Mr. GATHINGS submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was considered and agreed to

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

1 *Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate*
2 *concurring)*, That in the enrollment of the bill (H.R. 10788)
3 to amend section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956, the
4 Clerk of the House is authorized and directed to make the
5 following correction:

6 In line 12, on page 1, strike out "agreements" and
7 insert "agreement".

87TH CONGRESS
2^D Session

H. CON. RES. 493

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

That the Clerk of the House be authorized and directed to make a correction in said resolution.

By Mr. GATTINGS

JUNE 14, 1962

Considered and agreed to



Public Law 87-488
87th Congress, H. R. 10788
June 19, 1962

An Act

76 STAT. 104.

To amend section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 is amended by inserting the following after the first sentence thereof: "In addition, if a multilateral agreement has been or shall be concluded under the authority of this section among countries accounting for a significant part of world trade in the articles with respect to which the agreement was concluded, the President may also issue, in order to carry out such an agreement, regulations governing the entry or withdrawal from warehouse of the same articles which are the products of countries not parties to the agreement."

Textile imports.
Regulations.
70 Stat. 200.
7 USC 1854.

Approved June 19, 1962.

